

SENATE—Monday, July 6, 1970

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rabbi Jacob Handler, Ph. D., Temple Beth-Israel, Providence, R.I., offered the following prayer:

We reach out to Thee O Lord, for the right cause, so that those who have been delegated to speak for them, may be guided according to Thy light, Thy wisdom, and in full accordance with Thy will.

Give them the strength and the foresight fully to understand the problems facing our Nation and the world at large in order to render decisions with courage and fairness.

Down through the ages men have been speaking to Thee, O Lord, in varied tongues. We have cause to rejoice that in our blessed land of the free, the skeptic and the believer, the mystic and the rationalist, the humanist and the scientist can dwell together in harmony devoted to the common purpose of serving God and mankind.

May it be Thy will, O Lord, that unity, freedom, and justice may ever constitute our banner of glory.

Be with us, O Lord, and guide us on the path which leads to a better and a happier life—and a happier world to come. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 2, 1970, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the

call of the Legislative Calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE TODAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the able Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) be recognized at this time for not to exceed 20 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ELECTRONIC BATTLEFIELD

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I rise today to point out a classic example of the Pentagon's "foot-in-the-door technique," one of the main reasons why the military budget is out of control. I am informed that the Pentagon has already spent some \$2 billion on a secret weapons system called the electronic battlefield. Some estimate its ultimate cost at \$20 billion or more. To my knowledge this weapons system, as a weapons system, has never been directly authorized in the annual procurement bill in which major weapons systems are examined, judged, and passed on by the House and the Senate.

There are other ramifications as well. Among these are the fact that the system involves vast amounts of complicated electronic equipment—sensors, lasers, computers—which have been the major cause of cost overruns, late deliveries, and failures to meet specifications on a large number of other major weapons systems.

In addition to all of this, the electronic battlefield includes items which are difficult to control and which may well result in indiscriminate killing. Thus, there are reasons going beyond the huge potential cost of the system why public hearings and detailed reviews of the system should be held.

Mr. President, under article 1, section 8, of the Constitution, "The Congress shall have power to raise and support armies," and "to provide and maintain a Navy." The Constitution also provides that no appropriation of money for these uses shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

It is, therefore, widely assumed that Congress authorizes in the military authorization bill all of our major weapons systems—tanks, planes, ships, missiles, and the research which precedes them. Before the Pentagon builds a tank or a new airplane, Congress approves the project and authorizes the funds for its development. This system, of course, is not perfect. Even with congressional approval, as with the C-5A, the procurement of weapons systems leaves a great deal to be desired.

With regard to the electronic battlefield, I think it is safe to say that most

Congressmen have never heard of it. Like Topsy, it just grew. It exemplifies, as few other examples can, why the military budget is out of control.

Yet, speaking of this new system, Gen. William Westmoreland has said: "It will revolutionize ground warfare."

An industry source has called it "as advanced as the main battle tank and as complicated as the canceled F-111 electronics system." Designed to kill anything that moves, it cannot discriminate between enemy soldiers and women and children. Despite the fact that as a weapons system it has never been specifically authorized, it has already cost the American taxpayer almost \$2 billion. Some experts predict it will ultimately cost \$20 billion, almost twice as much as we are spending on the ABM and four times as much as we have spent on the C-5A. What is this new system? Although known by various code names, it has been called the automated battlefield by General Westmoreland. Among industry officials, it is more commonly known as the electronic battlefield. By any name, it is nothing less than an effort to develop a totally new method of waging ground warfare. Essentially, it is a system of sophisticated sensors designed to assist in the detection of enemy movements over wide areas. The system involves the use of data links, computer-assisted intelligence evaluation and automated fire controls. In a word, it is extremely complex. It requires vast amounts of complicated electronic equipment including:

First, whole families of acoustic, seismic, and magnetic devices to detect voices, footfalls, guns, and enemy troop carriers;

Second, high-powered lasers to illuminate targets with visible and invisible energy designed to guide bombs, rockets, and antitank weapons;

Third, millions of tiny "button bombs" that give a sonic or radio signal to remote receivers, pinpointing the position of anything that steps on them; and

Fourth, elaborate electronic command and control displays that pull together all data gathered by the electronic network and automatically show troop movements over vast areas of terrain.

In short, the electronic battlefield involves an entirely new concept in ground warfare, and if widely adopted, will require fundamental changes in the way our men fight.

Yet, this revolutionary weapons system on which as much as \$2 billion has already been spent, and upon which as much as \$20 billion may well be spent, has gone ahead beyond the research and development stage without any specific authorization of Congress. We have never been asked, Do you wish to authorize billions of dollars for the automated battlefield?

The program was developed as an outgrowth of the ill-fated McNamara wall in Vietnam. That was a sophisticated electronic barrier between North and South

Vietnam which was designed to stop North Vietnamese infiltration. When the original barrier concept was discarded as unworkable, the program was reoriented and renamed the electronic battlefield. No longer designed to provide an electronic barrier, it is now intended to provide complete surveillance of enemy movements through the use of sophisticated sensing devices backed by highly complex computer systems. First tested in Vietnam, the new devices are now undergoing intensive development for a variety of combat uses.

Perhaps the outstanding feature of the program is the sharp rise in costs which have been incurred. Although the official figures are secret, some published figures show how explosively the program costs have grown.

Research: In fiscal 1967 the Defense Department's Advanced Research Products Agency budgeted \$3.5 million for sensor studies. One year later the amount spent on research for the electronic battlefield had grown to \$82.8 million or over 25 times the amount spent the previous year.

Procurement: Two years after the start of the program, procurement costs for the new surveillance devices had risen from \$192.6 million in fiscal 1967 to \$524 million in fiscal 1969.

Although just over 2½ years old, the cost of the entire program, research, procurement, ammunition for testing, and funds from other sources—totals close to \$2 billion.

The most frightening fact about all of this is that this may be just the beginning of a cost spiral. Should the Armed Forces decide to deploy these devices in large numbers, costs could rise astronomically. This is so because much of the program consists of very expensive electronic devices supported by computer systems. If the experience the Pentagon has had with other complicated electronic systems such as that used in the F-111 is any kind of indicator, costs could increase spectacularly while performance is continually compromised.

But, in view of the size and nature of the program, the most shocking fact about the electronic battlefield is that it has never been directly authorized by Congress. The program has never been subjected to public hearings or a detailed review.

But what is more, the military contractors know more about the program than most Congressmen and Senators. Early in January of this year more than 800 defense contractors jammed the National Bureau of Standards auditorium for a classified briefing on the program's future. All the reports and predictions made at the meeting were classified, as is practically all of the information relating to the program.

Major problems and questions: The program raises several fundamental questions regarding not only congressional control over military spending, but also control over the secret development of new weapons.

Perhaps most important, how is Congress to control expenditures if it does

not even have knowledge, much less control, over major programs such as the electronic battlefield? The fact that the Pentagon could initiate such a large program without specific inclusion under the military authorization bill suggests that military spending may rise by several billion dollars more than we have been led to believe. How many more programs like the electronic battlefield costing millions of dollars and unknown to Congress has the Pentagon failed to include in the military authorization request? If Congress does not know about them, how can Congress approve them?

The second important set of questions which the program raises centers around the development of secret weapons and their future implications for military policy. General Westmoreland has said that the electronic battlefield will revolutionize ground combat. In a speech given last October before the Association of the U.S. Army, he declared:

The Army has undergone in Vietnam a quiet revolution in ground warfare—tactics, techniques, and technology. The revolution is not fully understood by many.

The financial implications alone of this so-called revolution are frightening. Will the Congress suddenly be told that it is essential that all ground forces be equipped with the new electronic sensors before the full implications of such a decision are known? Will we be told that the expenditure of almost \$20 billion is necessary if we are to match the Russians in ground capability? In short, will Congress be confronted with a "decision" on the electronic battlefield over which it has little control? These are just a few of the questions which are raised by the secret nature of the program.

The electronic battlefield also presents several other problems related to its use in combat. One of the biggest problems is that it may be an indiscriminate weapon. The sensors cannot tell the difference between soldiers and women and children. It has been pointed out that in such underdeveloped parts of the world as Vietnam, whole villages may be wiped out by seeding wide areas with air dropped explosive devices designed to kill anyone who ventures into their neighborhood. Once seeded, we would lose control over these devices and they could represent a permanent menace to the civilian population, much like old land mines.

A second major problem is presented by the extreme vulnerability of much of the electronic equipment to malfunction due to rough treatment. One infrared night observation device for use over medium range distances has already been abandoned because it could not withstand handling under combat conditions. In addition, the replacement costs alone for equipment damaged by rough handling could be enormous.

Finally, the most important, is the program really worth the money? Is combat capability increased to such an extent that the probable investment of billions of dollars is warranted? Once the Vietnam war is over, will we really need

such a complicated system of sensors for combat operations?

These are all questions which should be carefully examined before the Congress approves any more money for the electronic battlefield. They should be answered before we become committed to it as a weapons system. The program may not necessarily be a bad investment. My remarks today should not be interpreted as meaning necessarily opposition to the program. I am saying that it needs to be very carefully studied before additional money is committed for its development. I am asking for information. In an effort to obtain more information on the program, I have written a letter to Secretary of Defense Laird requesting answers to several questions related to the purpose and application of the electronic battlefield. I also intend to raise questions about it when the military authorization bill is before us. I believe it should be subjected to a full review before it goes any further.

Mr. President, the fact that a program of this size and importance has never been specifically authorized and that the Pentagon has spent almost \$2 billion on it, is outrageous. If Congress is to have any hope at all of controlling military spending it must have control over all major weapons systems. The electronic battlefield is no exception. It deserves the same detailed scrutiny to which all major weapons are subjected. I shall continue to work to see that it receives that review.

Mr. President, along that line, I think this is a perfect example of why we needed to have line items in the bills that come before Congress, even though it takes a 300- or 400-page bill. We should have a line item on each subject so that the Congress will know what it is voting on and will have a chance to find out where our money is going.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter I sent to Secretary Laird on this subject be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JUNE 28, 1970.

HON. MELVIN LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY LAIRD: Recently I learned of a new weapons system known as the electronic or automated battlefield. As I understand it, this is an integrated system of sensors which, according to General Westmoreland, "will revolutionize ground combat."

In view of the critical nature of the program, I would appreciate answers to the following questions. Although I am aware that much of the information related to the program is classified, I would like the responses to be unclassified?

1. When was this program started? What is the purpose of the program and which services are involved in its development?

2. When was the program authorized by Congress?

3. What costs have been incurred for research and procurement? What has been the total cost of the program to date?

4. What applications are planned for the program? Will the program be restricted to purely military intelligence?

5. What future developments are expected and what will be the probable cost of the program in the years ahead?

6. How effective have the sensors proven in actual combat? Where have they been used?

7. Are there any plans to equip all ground forces eventually with sensor devices and support systems? What would be the cost of such a decision?

Your answers to these questions will greatly improve understanding of the nature and purposes of the electronic battlefield program. Thank you for your cooperation and I shall look forward to hearing from you shortly.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAR PRISONERS NOT FORGOTTEN ON FOURTH OF JULY

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, over the past weekend most Americans looked at their country and themselves with fresh appreciation for what it means to be a citizen of the United States. For most it was a happy, indeed, a joyous occasion and there was a great outpouring of feeling and emotion.

The feelings of a small number of Americans, though, were tinged with sadness because their loved ones are still held incommunicado as prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese. Many of these families still do not know whether their men are alive or dead, whether they are well or ill.

At this time of rededication to freedom of all Americans, it is particularly appropriate to resolve that every effort shall be made to bring home those who are held prisoners as soon as possible so that, hopefully, the next Fourth of July will be as joyous an event for them as for the rest of America.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1251) to authorize the President to designate the period beginning August 2, 1970, and ending August 8, 1970, as "Professional Photography Week in America,"

in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 17868) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1251) to authorize the President to designate the period beginning August 2, 1970, and ending August 8, 1970, as "Professional Photography Week in America," was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN CERTAIN STATES

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Simon Run watershed, Iowa; Mt. Hope watershed, Kans.; West Upper Maple River, Mich.; Moorhead Bayou, Miss.; Upper Bay River, N.C.; Starkweather watershed, N. Dak.; Grand Prairie watershed, Oreg.; Poplar River, Wis.; and Spring Brook, Wis. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON RELEVANT LAWS AND REGULATIONS APPLICABLE TO PREVENT DISRUPTION OF GOVERNMENT FUNCTIONS BY CIVIL DEMONSTRATIONS AND DISORDERS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on relevant laws and regulations applicable to prevent disruption of Government functions by civil demonstrations and disorders (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE DISPOSAL OF MAGNESIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

A letter from the Assistant Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of magnesium from the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE DISPOSAL OF SELENIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

A letter from the Assistant Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of selenium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE DISPOSAL OF RARE-EARTH MATERIALS FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

A letter from the Assistant Administrator, General Services Administration, transmit-

ting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of rare-earth materials from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE DISPOSAL OF VANADIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

A letter from the Assistant Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of vanadium from the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE DISPOSAL OF KYANITE-MULLITE FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

A letter from the Assistant Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of kyanite-mullite from the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE DISPOSAL OF SISAL FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

A letter from the Assistant Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of sisal from the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE DISPOSAL OF METALLURGICAL-GRADE CHROMITE FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

A letter from the Assistant Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of metallurgical-grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE DISPOSAL OF COLUMBIUM FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

A letter from the Assistant Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of columbium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE DISPOSAL OF ABACA FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE

A letter from the Assistant Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of abaca from the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE DISPOSITION OF CHEMICAL-GRADE CHROMITE FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

A letter from the Assistant Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of chemical-grade chromite from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE DISPOSAL OF ANTIMONY FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND THE SUPPLEMENTAL STOCKPILE

A letter from the Assistant Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal of antimony from the national stockpile and the supplemental

stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of the United States, reporting, pursuant to law, the amount of Export-Import Bank loans, insurance, and guarantees, issued in April and May 1970, in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on problems resulting from deterioration of pavement on the Interstate Highway System, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, dated June 30, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on improvement needed in financial management activities of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., dated July 1, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the savings available to the Government by timing advances of loan and grant funds with actual cash requirements. Farmers Home Administration, Department of Agriculture, dated July 6, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF BOARD FOR FUNDAMENTAL EDUCATION

A letter from Ice, Miller, Donadio & Ryan, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Board for Fundamental Education for the years 1967 to 1969 and a copy of the audit of the Board's financial statements as of December 31, 1969 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to third- and sixth-preference classifications for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THIRD- AND SIXTH-PREFERENCE CLASSIFICATIONS FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to third- and sixth-preference classifications for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR PERIODIC, PRO RATA DISTRIBUTIONS OF UNCLAIMED POSTAL SAVINGS SYSTEM DEPOSITS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for periodic, pro rata distribution among the states and other jurisdictions of deposit of available amounts of unclaimed Postal Savings System deposits, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON MANPOWER AND TRAINING NEEDS FOR AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Manpower and Training Needs for Air Pollution Control, dated June 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT IN CERTAIN STATES

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement on Upper Ouachita River, Ark.; Crooked Arroyo watershed, Colo.; Clear Creek, Ill.; Fish Stream watershed, Maine; West Branch Westfield River, Mass.; East Upper Maple River, Mich.; Bahala Creek, Miss.; Newlan Creek, Mont.; McKay-Rock Creek, Oreg. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 68

("House Joint Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to consider the possibility of converting and operating Fort Detrick, Maryland, as a center for the study of environmental pollution.")

"Whereas, environmental pollution is of great concern to the people of Maryland and the people of the United States; and

"Whereas, Fort Detrick is to be vacated as a center for the study of biological warfare; and

"Whereas, Fort Detrick has facilities and trained personnel for efficient study of the matter of environmental pollution; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Congress of the United States be requested to consider the possibility of converting and operating Fort Detrick as a center for the study of environmental pollution; and, be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent, under the Great Seal of the State of Maryland, to the President and Vice President of the United States and members of the Maryland Delegation to the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 22

"House Joint Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to take favorable action on the Kerner Commission's recommendation that the federal government absorb the total cost of public welfare.

"Whereas, The Kerner Commission has recommended that the federal government absorb the total cost of public welfare; and

"Whereas, The present state budget for social services exclusive of correctional and juvenile services amounts to approximately 60 million dollars; and

"Whereas, The present state budget for community health and medical care services amounts to approximately 90 million dollars; and

"Whereas, The aforementioned appropriations for the public welfare currently comprise 19% of Maryland's annual budget; and

"Whereas, The counties and cities of this State contribute an additional 10 million dollars to the welfare program; and

"Whereas, the increasing costs of Medicaid under present conditions will appreciably add to state budgets in the future; and

"Whereas, Medicaid is a valuable program for the people of Maryland and should be continued; and

"Whereas, The cost of welfare programs is basically a federal responsibility; and

"Whereas, Absorption of welfare costs by the federal government would release hundreds of millions of dollars for both property tax reduction and needed new progressive programs for the underprivileged at the state level; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That this body strongly urges the Congress of the United States to take early favorable action on the aforementioned Kerner Commission recommendation so that appropriate planning for property tax reduction and needed new programs for the underprivileged can be initiated in the State; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Secretary of State under the Great Seal of the State of Maryland to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the members thereof from the State."

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 42

("Senate Joint Resolution requesting the Department of Natural Resources to pursue discussions with the Federal Government and with adjoining States in order to secure their cooperation in stopping the pollution of the Maryland waters.)

"The members of the General Assembly of Maryland are requesting the Department of Natural Resources of this State to initiate and pursue discussions with the Federal Government and with appropriate officials of adjoining States in order to secure their cooperation in stopping and abating the sources of pollution which are affecting Maryland waters.

"The State of Maryland, by reason of its geographic position and the flow of its rivers into the Chesapeake Bay and the Atlantic Ocean, is strongly affected by the action and lack of action of its neighbors.

"Thus, each day the City of Washington discharges enormous amounts of raw sewage in the Potomac River which is a Maryland stream throughout all its length, except that portion of the River opposite the District of Columbia.

"Along the upper and lower reaches of the Potomac River, it is bordered by the States of West Virginia and Virginia and a number of its tributaries flow southward into the Potomac River from sources in the State of Pennsylvania.

"The great Susquehanna River, which accounts for approximately 83% of the fresh water import into the Chesapeake Bay flows completely through the State of Pennsylvania from a source in the State of New York.

"Other streams also flowing into portions of Maryland have their origins or tributaries into adjoining States.

"It is vital that the cooperation of the Federal Government, the City of Washington and the States of Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania and Delaware be secured in order to reach the origin of sources of pollution in waters flowing into the State of Maryland; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Department of Natural Resources of this State is requested to initiate and pursue discussions with appropriate officials in the Federal Government and the City of Washington and, also, with appropriate officials and agencies in the States of Virginia, West Virginia, Pennsylvania and Delaware in order to do everything possible to reach and abate sources of pollution in the District of Columbia and in these other

States which ultimately affect the waters of the State of Maryland; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the State of Maryland is directed, under the Great Seal of the State of Maryland, to send copies of this Resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice-President of the United States, the Mayor of the City of Washington, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, the Governor of the State of West Virginia, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Governor of the State of Delaware."

A resolution adopted by the Missourians for National Security, Clayton, Missouri, praying for the issuance of an Executive Order to give the Subversive Activities Control Board authority to certify as subversive all domestic groups contributing to the communist threat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Toledo, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the funding of a program to provide part-time summer employment for the youth of the nation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 3728. A bill to amend the act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 988), as amended (43 U.S.C. 1411-18) and the act of September 19, 1964 (78 Stat. 988), as amended (43 U.S.C. 1421-27) (Rept. No. 91-1001).

By Mr. HATFIELD, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 2036. An act to remove a cloud on the titles of certain property located in Malin, Oreg. (Rept. No. 91-1000).

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. 3586. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to establish eligibility of new schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, veterinary medicine, and podiatry for institutional grants under section 771 thereof, to extend and improve the program relating to training of personnel in the allied health professions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1002).

REPORT OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION BICENTENNIAL COMMISSION—PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT (S. DOC. NO. 91-76)

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, created by an act of Congress, has submitted its required report to the President on the commemoration of the 200th year of the Nation's birth. Already, we are in what is termed the bicentennial era and many notable events are scheduled throughout this decade, centering around the year 1976.

It might be pointed out, Mr. President, that members of this Commission served long and hard, without any remuneration whatsoever, in order to produce this report.

From time to time, the Commission and its able staff, headed by Executive Director M. L. Spector, will issue studies and reports on individual events and projects.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-

sent that the Commission's report be printed as a Senate document in accordance with the usual procedure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BELLMON (for Mr. STEVENS): S. 4058. A bill to forgive a portion of some Small Business Administration loans granted as a result of the Good Friday earthquake of 1964; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.)

(The remarks of Mr. BELLMON when he introduced the bill appear later in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

S. 4058—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL EXTENDING SBA LOAN FORGIVENESS TO GOOD FRIDAY EARTHQUAKE

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, Senator STEVENS is in Kodiak, Alaska, today participating in the joint Public Works and Commerce Committee hearings which are very important to his State. Had he been here today he would have presented to the Senate a bill of great importance to his people of Alaska. In his absence he has asked that I introduce the measure for him.

I am, therefore, introducing a bill on behalf of the senior Senator from Alaska which will extend partial forgiveness of Small Business Administration loans to those made as a result of the Good Friday earthquake which devastated large areas of Alaska and the west coast States on March 27, 1964.

With the passage of the Disaster Relief Act of 1969, Congress recognized—

That a number of states have experienced extensive property loss and damage as a result of recent major disasters . . . and that there is a need for special measures designed to aid and accelerate the efforts of these affected states to reconstruct and rehabilitate the devastated areas.

The Disaster Relief Act of 1969 provided this special measure of aid by partial forgiveness of SBA loans incurred from disasters since July 1, 1967.

Senator STEVENS has been informed by the SBA that approximately 50 disaster areas have become eligible for the forgiveness feature of the 1969 Disaster Relief Act. These areas are:

State, counties and parishes	Cause	SBA Declaration Date
NORTHEASTERN AREA		
Maine: All areas		Dec. 31, 1969
NEW YORK AREA		
New York: Cattaraugus		Oct. 3, 1967
New York: Bergen, Essex, Middlesex, Morris, Passaic, Somerset, Union		June 3, 1968
New York: Sullivan		Aug. 1, 1969
MIDDLE ATLANTIC AREA		
Kentucky: Bracken, Greenup, Jessamine, Mason, Pendleton (with Ohio)		Apr. 25, 1968

State, counties and parishes	Cause	SBA Declaration Date
Ohio: Brown, Scioto (with Kentucky)		Apr. 25, 1968
Athens, Butler, Clinton, Gallia, Hocking, Jackson, Ross, Warren		May 29, 1968
Kentucky: Allen, Warren		June 25, 1969
Ohio: All areas		July 11, 1969
Pennsylvania: Carbon, Schuylkill		Aug. 8, 1969
Virginia: All areas	Rains	Aug. 21, 1969
West Virginia: All areas	do.	Aug. 22, 1969
Kentucky: Harlan County	Flood	Jan. 2, 1970

SOUTHEASTERN AREA

Florida: All areas	(?)	Oct. 21, 1968
Tennessee: Macon		June 25, 1969
Mississippi: All areas	(?)	Aug. 18, 1969
Alabama: All areas	(?)	Do.
All areas affected	Tornado	Mar. 27, 1970

MIDWESTERN AREA

Iowa: All areas		May 17, 1968
Illinois: All areas		Do.
Iowa: Black Hawk, Bremer, Buchanan, Butler		July 19, 1968
Minnesota: Blue Earth		Aug. 12, 1968
All areas (with Iowa, North and South Dakota, and Wisconsin)		Apr. 15, 1968
Iowa: All areas (with Wisconsin, North and South Dakota, Iowa, and Minnesota)		Do.
Wisconsin: All areas (with Iowa, North and South Dakota, and Minnesota)		Do.
Illinois: Rock Island		May 5, 1969
Minnesota: Nobles		July 2, 1969
Iowa: Marshall, Tama		July 15, 1969
Illinois: Jo Daviess, Stephenson		July 8, 1969

SOUTHWESTERN AREA

Texas: All areas	(?)	Sep. 20, 1967
Arkansas: Sebastian		Apr. 22, 1968
Arkansas: Garland, Pulaski, Sebastian, Sevier		May 15, 1968
Arkansas: All areas		May 17, 1968
Oklahoma: Le Flore		May 21, 1968
Texas: All areas	Storm Candy	June 25, 1968
Louisiana: All areas	(?)	Aug. 18, 1969
Texas: Northwest areas	Tornado	April 18, 1970
Lubbock County	do.	May 12, 1970
Hayes County	Flood	May 15, 1970

ROCKY MOUNTAIN AREA

Kansas: Ness		June 2, 1967
Garden City, Finney		June 26, 1967
Nebraska: All counties through which 183 passes, etc.		June 16, 1967
North Dakota: All areas (with Minnesota, South Dakota, etc.)		Apr. 15, 1969
South Dakota: All areas (with North Dakota, etc.)		Do.
Kansas: Saline		June 25, 1969
Colorado: Boulder and Jefferson Counties	Flood	Dec. 26, 1969
North Dakota: Ransom County	do.	June 2, 1970

PACIFIC COASTAL AREA

Alaska: Fairbanks, etc.		Aug. 16, 1967
California: San Luis Obispo		Jan. 21, 1969
Los Angeles		Jan. 23, 1969
Riverside		Jan. 27, 1969
Fresno, Tulare, Stanislaus		Jan. 29, 1969
Contra Costa		Mar. 3, 1969
Marin County	Flood	Dec. 30, 1969
All areas	Flood	Feb. 3, 1970

Camille.
Gladys.
Beulah.

Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana received forgiveness on loans resulting from the Hurricane Betsy disaster in September 1965, under a special forgiveness act similar to the one I am proposing today.

During the Good Friday earthquake and the ensuing tidal waves, the State of Alaska suffered damages totaling millions

of dollars. Fatalities and tidal damage occurred as far south as Crescent City, Calif., and the Small Business Administration subsequently granted 1,325 loans for a total of \$90,930,000 to assist in reconstruction. This earthquake was the most severe seismic disturbance ever registered in this country, and many of the victims of this disaster have not yet recovered. The bill I am introducing on behalf of Senator STEVENS will match the provisions of section 7 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1969 and provide a forgiveness of SBA loans not to exceed \$1,800 per loan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4058) to forgive a portion of some Small Business Administration loans granted as a result of the Good Friday earthquake of 1964, introduced by Mr. BELLMON, for Mr. STEVENS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 3723

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) be added as cosponsors of S. 3723, to provide for orderly trade in textile articles and articles of leather footwear, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3752

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) be added as a cosponsor of S. 3752, to amend the Fair Packaging and Labeling Act to require the disclosure by retail distributors of unit retail prices of consumer commodities, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3986

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) be added as a cosponsor of S. 3986, to create the Rural Development Highways Act of 1970, to encourage a more balanced geographical dispersal of the Nation's people and industry and to generally promote the economic and social development of our rural communities and to discourage a continuing of those urban concentration trends which are considered to be undesirable, through a more effective use, location, and design of the federally aided highway system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 4041

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) be added as a

cosponsor of S. 4041, to repeal section 7275 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to amounts to be shown on airline tickets and advertising.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on July 1, 1970, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 4012) to extend the Clean Air Act, as amended, and the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as amended, for a period of 60 days.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1971—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 763

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. President, the Senate will soon face the question of funding the food stamp program. The Appropriations Committee has recommended that only \$1.25 billion of the \$2 billion authorized by the Senate last fall be appropriated.

In testimony presented before the Select Committee on Nutrition on June 19, 1970, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture Lyng told of impressive increases in participation in the food stamp program.

But the Assistant Secretary also told my committee that the \$1.25 billion appropriation requested last winter for food stamps would not permit further expansion of the program. He said:

The acceptance of the food stamp program has been such that we may have some very real problems in the coming fiscal year 1971. It is beginning to be very apparent to us that counties which may want to switch to food stamps will have to be denied because this appropriation figure (1.25 billion) will be insufficient.

While gains have been made, we must understand that the job of feeding America's hungry has only just begun. To stop now would be indefensible.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the following tables which show the percentage of the poor in each State who are receiving either food stamps or commodities be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I believe that these tables conclusively demonstrate the need for full funding of the food stamp program. I hope that my colleagues will agree and that they will join with me at the appropriate time to insure that this critical program is adequately funded.

I also ask unanimous consent that a statement by Jean Mayer, professor of nutrition at Harvard University and chairman of the First White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, it is my present intention to move at the appropriate time to raise the appropriation for the food stamp program to the full \$2 billion authorized by the Senate last fall.

Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators BROOKE, GORE, HART, HOLLINGS, JAVITS, KENNEDY, MONDALE, SCHWEIKER, SPONG, and YARBOROUGH, I submit an

amendment, intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 17923) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLE). The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment, table, and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

On page 20, line 24, strike out "\$1,250,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,000,000,000".

The table, presented by Mr. MCGOVERN, is as follows:

State	Percentage of poor in food stamp program	Percentage of poor in commodity distribution program	Total percentage in programs
Alabama.....	16.3	27.5	43.8
Alaska.....	76		76
Arizona.....		47	47
Arkansas.....	28	3	31
California.....	41	14.5	55.5
Colorado.....	48		48
Connecticut.....	53	6.4	59.4
Delaware.....		56	56
District of Columbia.....	25		25
Florida.....	1.4	28	29.4
Georgia.....	11	19	30
Hawaii.....	24		24
Idaho.....		26	26
Illinois.....	36		36
Indiana.....	18	11	29
Iowa.....	24	1.7	25.7
Kansas.....	.7	13	13.7
Kentucky.....	28	10	38
Louisiana.....	38	5.6	43.6
Maine.....	5.7	52.5	58.2
Maryland.....	28	4.5	32.5
Massachusetts.....	12	32.5	32.62
Michigan.....	29	8	37
Minnesota.....	21.5	4.1	25.6
Mississippi.....	37	15.5	52.5
Missouri.....	7.4	28	35.4
Montana.....	28	19.5	47.5
Nebraska.....	21	1.2	22.2
Nevada.....		25	25
New Jersey.....	41		41
New Hampshire.....		2.5	2.5
New Mexico.....	63	19	82
New York.....	5.4	40	45.4
North Carolina.....	11.5	13	24.5
North Dakota.....	15.5	18	33.5
Ohio.....	37	2.1	39.1
Oklahoma.....	19	57	57
Oregon.....	19	63	82
Pennsylvania.....	28	1.5	29.5
Rhode Island.....	42		42
South Carolina.....	27		27
South Dakota.....	16	20.0	36
Tennessee.....	27	3.3	30.3
Texas.....	6.2	15.0	21.2
Utah.....	26		26
Vermont.....	36		36
Virginia.....	11	6.3	17.3
Washington.....	80		80
West Virginia.....	52		52
Wisconsin.....	16.5	13.0	29.5
Wyoming.....	33	6.9	39.9
Total.....	22	14.0	36

Note: Based on USDA commodity distribution figures for March 1970, and USDA food stamp figure for April 1970.

The statement, presented by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

Last December, in his speech at the opening of the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health, the President pledged himself and the Nation—that is all of us—"to eliminate hunger and malnutrition due to poverty from America for all times." I believe that almost all Americans approved of this commitment. Surely, there is nothing more disgraceful—and more ridiculous—than for our Nation to spend close to six billion of dollars to keep our agricultural production down, when millions of Americans are deprived of sufficient wholesome foods to maintain good health.

The Congress has it in its power by devot-

ing sufficient appropriations to the Food Stamp Program (a minimum of 2 billion dollars) as well as by finally passing a satisfactory Food Stamp Act with free food stamps for the very poor to fulfill our national commitment. Cutting down the appropriation to 1.25 billion means that millions will not be able to take advantage of this rational, dignified method of support and will be thrown back on the commodity program—"poor people's food."

Increasing the expenditures for food stamps should cut down significantly on the need for expenditures for price support. The fact that our productive capacity for food is much greater than our actual production also means that increased expenditures for food (as opposed to other goods or services in short supply) should have only little inflationary effect.

Finally, it is worth noting that recent deflationary measures which tend to increase unemployment and the delays in Congress in implementing the Family Assistance Plan both make the expansion of the Food Stamp Program particularly urgent. I urge the Congress to fully fund the program.

JEAN MAYER,
Professor of Nutrition,
Harvard University.

JULY 3, 1970.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1971—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 764

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 17548) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON S. 3354, TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL LAND USE POLICY

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, a final hearing on S. 3354, my bill to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to establish a national land use policy, will be held before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on Wednesday, July 8, 1970, at 10 a.m. in room 3110, New Senate Office Building.

In the hearings to date, the committee has heard from prominent officials of the Federal Government, including Chairman Russell Train of the Council on Environmental Quality, who testified on behalf of the Nixon administration; Representative ROGERS MORTON, of Maryland; Chairman John Nassikas, of the Federal Power Commission; and the Honorable John Carver, former Under Secretary of the Interior, who is now a member of the Federal Power Commission. State government, which would play a central role in the national land use policy, has been ably represented by Gov. John Love, of Colorado, chairman of the National Governors' Conference, who has played a leading role in State land use planning; and Gov. Francis Sargent, of Massachusetts, whose credentials as a public offi-

cial concerned about the quality of the environment are widely known.

Citizen groups and experts in fields related to land use planning have also given the committee the benefit of their experience and expertise. The National Wildlife Federation, the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, and the American Forestry Association are among the organizations dedicated to conservation of the country's natural resources which have testified. Prominent attorneys, planners, architects, landscape architects, and foresters have also been heard by the committee in its consideration of the measure.

In addition to the oral testimony, the committee has solicited written comment on the bill from each of the State Governors, and their replies have been made a part of the hearing record. Many other valuable comments, both solicited and spontaneous, have been received and are given serious consideration.

The overwhelming reaction to S. 3354 has been that a national land use policy is an idea whose time has come. There have been many constructive suggestions concerning particular provisions of the bill, and the committee staff has carefully recorded them for our consideration. But such reservations as have been expressed concern questions of administration and method of implementation of the policy, not the need for a policy itself. I am truly gratified at the response the bill has received.

The final hearing will round out the committee's public consideration of S. 3354 by featuring representatives of industry and local government, as well as the conservation community. Mr. Harry Woodbury, senior vice president of the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, along with Mr. James Turnbull, executive vice president of the National Forest Products Association, will present some industry viewpoints. A panel of county government planners, representing a broad spectrum of constituencies from urban to rural, will offer some local government perspectives. A spokesman for the Sierra Club is also expected to testify.

I am pleased to announce this hearing and to extend an invitation to each of the 18 cosponsors of S. 3354, and any other Senators who would care to come, to join the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for this final morning of testimony on what I consider one of the most important pieces of environmental legislation now before the Senate.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS OF SENATORS

NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF CONSULTANTS ON THE CONQUEST OF CANCER STARTS WORK ON ITS IMPORTANT TASK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on April 27, 1970, the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 376 which established the National Committee of Consultants on the Conquest of Cancer, under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

As chairman of the Committee on La-

bor and Public Welfare, I want to report to the Senate that some of the Nation's best research, management, and organizational men have agreed to serve on this committee. On Monday, June 29, the committee held its first meeting. The committee met in the Labor and Public Welfare Committee hearing room with Mr. Benno Schmidt, chairman of the executive committee, board of trustees, Memorial Hospital for Cancer and Allied Diseases, Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research as the committee chairman and Dr. Sidney Farber, former president of the American Cancer Society and now director of research, Children's Cancer Research Foundation, Children's Hospital, Boston, Mass., as cochairman.

Other members of the committee are Mr. I. W. Abel, president, United Steelworkers of America, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Mr. Elmer Bobst, chairman of the board, Warner Lambert Pharmaceutical Co., New York, N.Y.; Mr. Emerson Foote, advertising consultant—former president, Foote, Cone & Belding; former president and chairman, McCann-Erickson, Inc.—New York, N.Y.; Mr. G. Keith Funston, former president of the New York Stock Exchange, now chairman of the board, Olin Corp., member of board, American Cancer Society, Stamford, Conn.; Mrs. Anna Rosenberg Hoffman—Mrs. Paul G. Hoffman—former Assistant Secretary of Defense; public information and labor relations consultant, New York, N.Y.; Mr. Emil Mazey, secretary-treasurer, United Automobile Workers, Detroit, Mich.; Mr. Jubel R. Parten, member of board, Fund for the Republic, former chairman of the board, Pure Oil Co., Bank of Southwest, Houston, Tex.; Mr. Laurance S. Rockefeller, president, Memorial Hospital, chairman, Rockefeller Brothers, Inc., New York, N.Y.; and Mr. William McC. Blair, Jr., general director, John F. Kennedy Center for Performing Arts—former U.S. Ambassador to the Philippines and Denmark—Washington, D.C.

Also, Dr. Joseph Burchenal, vice president, Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, New York, N.Y.; Dr. R. Lee Clark, director, M. D. Anderson Institute, Houston, Tex.; Dr. Paul B. Cornely, president, American Public Health Association, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Solomon Garb, scientific director, American Medical Center at Denver, Spivak, Colo.; Dr. James F. Holland, chief of medicine A, Roswell Park Memorial Institute for Cancer Research, Buffalo, N.Y.; Dr. Mathilde Krim, associate, Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, New York, N.Y.; Dr. Joshua Lederberg, professor of genetics, Stanford University School of Medicine, Palo Alto, Calif.; Dr. Jonathan E. Rhoads, professor and chairman, Department of Surgery, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Harold Rusch, professor of cancer research, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.; Dr. William B. Hutchinson, president and director, Pacific Northwest Research Foundation, Seattle, Wash.; and Dr. Wendell Scott, Washington University School of Medicine, St. Louis, Mo.

Mr. President, my remarks at the opening session outline the great need for this committee's work and its goals. I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR
RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

On behalf of my 53 Senatorial colleagues from both major political parties who have sponsored the resolution authorizing this major study of cancer, I welcome you to this historic hearing room of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Over the years, some of the most significant health legislation ever enacted by the Congress has been voted upon within these walls.

However, I venture to say that none of the previous challenges we have grappled with in this room exceeds in importance the crusade we have embarked upon today. As I told the Senate in introducing the authorizing resolution on March 25th of this year, we are asking this distinguished group of scientists and laymen to recommend to the Congress and to the American people what must be done to achieve cures for the major forms of cancer by 1976—the 200th anniversary of the founding of this great Republic. I need not point out to most of you who have spent your entire lives combating this insidious disease that the incidence of cancer in America has reached epidemic proportions. Last year, it killed more than 300,000 Americans—more than thirty times the number of young men who lost their lives in combat in Southeast Asia in that same year.

As you know, the purpose of this study, as specified in S. Res. 376, which authorized the creation of this group, is to make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to: (1) the present scope of scientific research conducted by governmental and non-governmental agencies directed toward the causes and means for the treatment, cure, and elimination of Cancer; (2) the prospect for success in such endeavors; and (3) means and measures necessary or desirable to facilitate success in such endeavors at the earliest possible time. This distinguished panel will be expected to report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

In my 13 years of service in the Senate, I have frequently expressed my puzzlement that no large, goal-directed effort has ever been launched against this disease. In the atomic and nuclear energy fields, we set national goals and we achieved them; in outer space, President Kennedy in 1960 announced the goal of landing a man on the moon within a decade, and we have achieved it.

Why can we not apply the same managerial and organizational talents used in the physical sciences to the conquest of mankind's most dreaded enemy?

Over the years, we in the Senate have listened to the testimony of scientists expert in the field of cancer who have assured us time and time again that they could wipe this curse from the face of the earth if this nation so wills it, and if it is ready to spend the money necessary to complete the mission.

As a layman, I particularly welcome on this committee those of you who have broad managerial and industrial experience. I want you to take a long, hard look at the way in which cancer rips into the very fabric and strength of this democracy. Five years ago, a Presidential Commission estimated the cost of cancer to our economy as in excess of eight billion dollars a year. Losses in productivity and earning capacity are astounding—in the age group 25 to 64 years, which accounts for 45 percent of all cancer victims, 100,000 man

years of productivity are lost annually. If this loss in productivity is multiplied by the working life span of the average American, the eight billion dollar estimated loss is only the tip of the iceberg.

The earlier 1964 Presidential Commission made recommendations which for one reason or another were not fully or effectively implemented. We cannot afford to let that happen again. We cannot afford to submit any recommendations without specifying how they should be implemented. Accordingly, the ultimate objective of this entire effort should be recommendations with plans for implementation. The recommendations should be practical and realistic and to the extent possible should indicate, step-by-step, precisely how the implementation should be accomplished. This implies the preparation of a coordinated plan.

As a nation, we cannot afford business-as-usual budgets in the battle to conquer cancer. After 33 years of existence, the current budget of the National Cancer Institute is less than \$200,000,000. We spend ten times this sum in hospitalization costs for cancer victims each year. We spend twenty times this sum in federal expenditures alone for highway construction each year.

I know you can do the job. When I introduced the resolution setting up this committee last March, I thought I was doing a little bragging when I assured the Senate that "this committee will be composed of some of the nation's most distinguished scientists and lay leaders who have dedicated their lives to the eventual conquest of cancer." As I look around this room, I know now that I wasn't bragging—I was underestimating the caliber of the distinguished galaxy of Americans gathered here today. It is a source of the deepest satisfaction to me that all of you, with the tremendously demanding lives that you lead, are willing to make this sacrifice of time and effort to achieve our joint mission.

I pledge you the full cooperation of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee in this endeavor. We look forward with the greatest anticipation to the completion of your report sometime this Fall, and we are confident that it will make a contribution which may very well change the course of the history of mankind.

A list of the Committee members can be found in the folders which each of you have before you.

HONOR AMERICA DAY

Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. President, this past weekend between 250,000 and 400,000 Americans came to Washington, D.C., to celebrate Independence Day, the flag, and this experiment in liberty that we call the United States of America.

These were Americans who are proud of their country, unashamed in their affection for our history, and bearing peaceful witness to their faith in the American dream.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Washington Daily News of July 6, 1970, and an article by David Lawrence, published in the Washington Evening Star of July 6, 1970, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News,
July 6, 1970]

FREAKS AND THE FOURTH OF JULY

There was an engagingly old-fashioned air to the Honor America Day goings-on in the nation's capital; shirt-sleeved family groups picnicking on the grass, listening to patriotic oratory and stirring band music, hearing about religion's role in building America, watching fireworks light up the night sky.

There was the same easy familiarity in the entertainment program put on by Bob Hope. If some of the stars seemed to have been around since the founding of the Republic, it was good to know that they were alive and well in Washington.

We think that most of the 250,000 people who took part in the day and many millions who watched it on TV had a good time. And many of them may have benefitted, in this time of division and doubt, from the day's reminder of how much is right and decent in this country.

What was not familiar, or likeable, about the day were efforts by a small number—about 4,000—of hippies and yuppies to disrupt the celebrations. It may be news to beards, weirdies, pot heads and freaks, but one of the things America is all about is fair play for the other fellow.

During the recent antiwar demonstrations here in Washington, we were struck by the restraint of the police and the majority of the citizenry who did not approve of the marchers. (Any attempt to interfere would, of course, have been met with loud cries of "Fascism!" or "Repression!")

But when Middle America gathered to honor the flag, a fringe of the New Left loosed obscene chants at Billy Graham and Kate Smith. It hurled bottles and firecrackers into crowds containing children, and it "liberated" (looted is a better word) refreshment stands.

There are, we think a few lessons in the yippie behavior during Washington's Fourth of July. One concerns those who sewed the American flag on their trouser seats or paraded in the nude. They are poor, pathetic creatures trying to shock the bourgeoisie, and you don't have to discuss the Vietnam war seriously with a clown with a bare behind.

A second concerns the bottle-throwers, platform-seizers, and obscenity-chanters. They are very few and not really dangerous, and there are plenty of disorderly-conduct laws to deal with them.

It would be a ludicrous mistake to be stampeded by a handful of violence-freaks into passing repressive laws that, in time, could restrict everybody's freedom.

[From the Washington Evening Star, July 6, 1970]

JULY 4 COULD STRESS REAL GOALS (By David Lawrence)

A good, old-fashioned Fourth of July was symbolized in Washington by the "Honor America Day" celebration on Saturday which was witnessed by a crowd of 350,000 to 400,000 people on the grounds between the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument. Not only did this touch the hearts of the "silent majority" who have tired of the outbursts of treasonable utterances and damaging disorders—known as "anti-war" demonstrations—but it also gratified millions of other citizens who feel that America is worth the love and reverence conveyed in the national anthem and patriotic songs.

Unfortunately, in contrast the news dispatches reported simultaneously that some of the "youth generation"—which is supposed to have new ideas and is demanding "change"—were engaging in a rock-music festival in Atlanta. Physicians there were pleading for state and federal help because the drug situation at the festival had gotten out of control.

The celebration in Washington got national and international attention. It was a well-planned effort to emphasize that Americans are still dedicated to the fundamental principles of free government and are happy with the progress that has been made in the 194 years of our history.

An interfaith religious service led by Billy Graham elicited much applause, and the entertainment by Bob Hope and other television stars wound up a day of celebration unique

in history. Political subjects, moreover, were not touched upon.

It seems sad, though, that the program had to be so tactfully arranged as to eliminate any direct tribute to the thousands of American youth who have died in Vietnam. Yet they are true patriots of the era. For they have helped to prevent a third world war and to save the American people from suffering huge casualties. Dictatorships abroad were twice given the impression that "isolationism" had persuaded American public opinion to abandon the rest of the world. In each case, these miscalculations of American resoluteness led to world wars that could have been avoided if within the United States there had been solidarity and a nonpartisan attitude.

Today those in the "younger generation" who have been carrying on "anti-war demonstrations" haven't been reading history carefully and haven't been observing the uneasiness of European and Asian countries lately about the supposed lessening of the American military presence on both continents.

In recent years, the Fourth of July has been a holiday celebrated mostly in pleasure-seeking hours. It would, however, be a constructive precedent if the day were used also for nationally televised speeches emphasizing the progress the United States has been making in a complex world in which the growing population presents undreamed-of challenges. Here, for instance, are only a few of the problems currently before Congress:

Pollution—The President advocates the use of state and federal funds to curb water pollution. The program would cost \$10 billion over the next five years. Congress is working on the legislation.

Education—A \$4.8 billion appropriation bill is pending to finance all major federal-aid-to-education projects and to help Southern schools meet the costs of desegregation.

Welfare—An administration plan has been passed by the House and sent to the Senate which would provide a family of four a minimum income of \$1,600 a year. The family's income could rise as high as \$3,290 before the \$1,600 subsidy would be eliminated.

Housing—The Senate and House are working in conference on bills to encourage the housing mortgage market including bills to authorize \$250 million to subsidize home-mortgage interest payments of a certain type.

Crime—The House has passed a three-year bill appropriating \$3.2 billion for safe streets assistance, and the Senate has approved the organized crime bill. Hearings are being held on other proposals.

Lots of controversies and differences of opinion between the President and Congress prevail as to the amounts to be authorized. But in what other country in the world are there being spent, year after year, vast sums to provide for the safety and welfare of the population, which in America now has grown to more than 200 million? These are the things worth rejoicing over on the Fourth of July.

CHET HUNTLEY TO RETURN TO HIS NATIVE MONTANA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, yesterday, the New York Times published an article on the plans of Chet Huntley, NBC newscaster, to return to his native State of Montana. Chet Huntley has written of his early years in Montana, in his remembrances of his frontier boyhood, "The Generous Years." He grew up in a similar environment in northern Montana to mine in western Montana. It was nostalgic to read his book and a privilege to review it. Anyone who reads "The Generous Years" can understand why Chet wants to go home.

I ask unanimous consent that my review and the New York Times article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NATIVE SON WRITES A MONTANA LOVE STORY

(Remembrances of a Frontier Boyhood, by Chet Huntley; Random House, 215 pp., \$4.95. Reviewed by Senator LEE METCALF.)

Montanans are just a little prouder of native sons and daughters who become nationally famous than are the citizens of more populous states. At the same time, the men and women who leave Montana for the cities of the east and the west coast never lose their affection for their home state. Hence the popularity of such native Montanans as Gary Cooper and Myrna Loy and Chet Huntley in their home state.

Chet Huntley has written a love story about Montana in *The Generous Years*. Here he tells about his early life at a time that was singularly innocent compared with the hectic days of the 60s and at a place that was wonderful for a boy.

Chet Huntley's family homesteaded near Saco, Montana, along the Great Northern Railroad in 1913. He tells of a boyhood in Saco that is very like the boyhood I experienced in Stevensville during the same period. In a nostalgic and perceptive book, Chet Huntley has described his boyhood and adolescence on a Montana farm and in a typical small Montana town. The work on the farm, the harnessing of the horses, coping with the eccentricities of a Model T, working with the sheep and the cattle and the chickens, the thrill of the first visit to town which will never be recaptured on later trips to the great cities of the world are stories that will evoke memories from every farm boy and girl who grew up in the west during the period between World War I and World War II.

The epilogue is an eloquent, moving and poetic tribute to Montana and will be a part of the permanent literature of Montana. I predict that portions of it will be memorized by students in future years and recited at declamation contests, and it will be paraphrased by orators and politicians in future campaigns.

In reciting the saga of a pioneer boyhood, Chet has written an evocative and enjoyable book. But when he essays into other areas, he drops the ball. At times background in the history of Montana or statistics about Montana are necessary to understand the narrative. These are added. But somehow those born in Montana who have emigrated to the east feel a compulsion to tell about the war of the Copper Kings and the Anaconda company's domination of Montana in political and economic affairs of the 20s and 30s. And when Chet seeks to summarize that period, he proves that he is a better current commentator than historian.

He tells about W. A. Clark and his rivalry with Marcus Daly and describes how Clark won election to the Senate in the Montana legislature by the simple procedure of throwing bundles of \$20-bills over the transom of legislators' rooms in Helena hotels. But then he says that Clark was met at the door of the U.S. Senate and barred by the sergeant at arms from taking his seat. In fact there was no objection to the seating of Clark. After he was seated, a petition was filed contesting his election.

Clark served in the Senate from Dec. 4, 1899, until May 15, 1900, when he addressed the Senate on a point of personal privilege and then resigned. Nor was Montana without a Senator for 11 years as a result of this struggle. Rather, it was about 17 months.

Chet's remarks about schools and school teachers will probably be reprinted by the

Montana devotees of the one-room schoolhouse. It will be circulated to the Montana legislature to answer those who want to raise teachers' salaries and increase appropriations for operation of Montana schools. His comments on teachers' unions and dedicated teachers may have grown out of current unrest in our schools.

As a story of the life of a boy on a Montana farm in years when farming was a hard and difficult life, before the REA, before modern machinery, before paved highways, this is a book that will bring back memories to men and women everywhere who spent their childhood living close to the soil while their parents coped with the elements, with drought and grasshoppers and hail and frost and had no problems with farm bills and price supports and subsidies.

Forget about the historical inaccuracies and read about this book as a reminiscence of a typical, normal and delightful early life in a special place in the world, Montana and you will understand why Montana will always have a special meaning for all of us.

Good job, Chet.

CHET GETS READY TO SAY, "GOOD-BY, DAVID"

(By Fred Ferretti)

Much of what he says, and many of the things he has done, bespeak in Chet Huntley a longing for another time.

Born and reared more than a half-century ago along the Northern Pacific's Montana right-of-way, he could just as easily have been any of those guys Gary Cooper played if he had not won a debating contest and drifted into broadcasting. He raises cattle and wears Stetsons. His boyhood hero was his grandfather, whom he remembers romantically as a superb saloon brawler. A paternal descendant of John Adams and John Quincy Adams, Huntley reeks of independence. He subscribes to no political party. He refuses to be dropped into any ideological bag. Conservatives have called him Communist. Blacks have intimated that he's soft on segregation. He has been a Vietnam Hawk and an Indochina Dove.

He likes thrift and Boy Scouts and those anonymous doers of civic good, the Order of DeMolay. He likes the western desert and climbing hills and trout. He used to like May Day "in those innocent years before the proletariat turned it into a brash and chauvinistic holiday," and he still prefers one-room schoolhouses. "There was more happiness and contentment in those days when we had little." A philosophical maverick who is alternately square and with it, he has been called a scab by his union and a violator of the public interest by his government. Disputation has dogged his public life, yet it would appear that most often Huntley courted controversy, reveled in it, bathed in it.

Now at the top of his personal form, with only the barest hint of a downturn showing; with television news' influence at its peak; with Huntley lately emerged as one of broadcasting's more outspoken opponents of Spiro Agnew, he has decided to quit. And not surprisingly, the why of his departure has precipitated anger and opposition—out in his native Montana no less.

At the end of July, after 15 years, Chester Robert Huntley will say "Good night, David" to Brinkley for the last time and begin shilling for Big Sky, a rich man's all-service western resort out in Bozeman, Montana, that a few of the townsfolk believe will muck up the ecology of the Gallatin River Valley.

Recently, sitting in his fifth-floor office in the R.C.A. Building, glancing often . . . into Radio City Music Hall, Huntley spoke of Big Sky, of Montana, of himself, his trade and his future. Except for the steel filing cases at one end of the room and a tan linen sofa flat against a long wall, it could have been the set of Marshal Dillon's office on

"Gunsmoke." A perspective map of Helena, Montana. A huge old oaken rolltop desk ("My Dad's"). A street map bearing the legend "Virginia, City of Montana." An award, The Order of the Grizzly. And over the desk, a Winchester .73 rifle. On a chair next to the desk, a doe-colored Stetson. And Chet's face, lined, craggy, sincere.

Big Sky of Montana, Inc., has occupied most of Huntley's time for the last several months, "so much so that I guess I've been goofing off, not writing as much of the program as I'd like," he said. Big Sky, an estimated \$15-million project, is projected as a resort for the well-to-do, with a full range of athletic facilities, private apartments, permanent homes and village facilities. It will be situated 45 miles south of Bozeman, near Yellowstone National Park in southwestern Montana. Most of the surrounding towns have indicated that they're anxiously awaiting the expected boom, but some cattlemen and conservationists see the resort, backed by the Chrysler Realty Corporation, "as the Big City east coming in and ruining our country."

Huntley called his latest opponents "a small group of people who do not qualify as conservationists. As far as I can determine, they have a track record of not liking anything. They're the same people who said 'We don't like airplanes,' and 'The Jet Set will be coming in here.' What they're saying is 'Let's keep Montana as our private little club.' If that happens, they'll be up for some real exploitation."

"I've fished and climbed and camped those 11,000 acres. I know them. And they're going to be preserved. We've had engineering studies done. There will be no spoilage. We're going to use total electric energy. There will be no smoke, no noxious gases. You know, before we bought the property there were 6,000 trees due to be cut. Now we've got the timber rights and that's not what's going to happen. We're not coming in to make a buck and run." Huntley says there will be "no hunting allowed. There's moose, elk, deer, bighorn sheep, mountain lions, and bear. They won't be touched."

His father was a telegrapher, and Huntley, who was born Dec. 10, 1911, in Cardwell, Montana, moved through Saco, Scoby, Willow Creek, Logan, Big Timber, Norris, Whitehall, Bozeman and Reedpoint before winning a scholarship to Montana State College in 1929. Three years of premed led nowhere, until he won a national oratory contest and a scholarship to the Cornish School of Arts in Seattle in 1932.

He switched to the University of Washington the next year, and "since my Dad was only working two days a week in the Depression," he supported himself by working as a waiter, a telegram delivery boy, by washing windows and selling pints of his blood. In 1934 he got a \$10-a-month job with a 100-watt station, KCBC, in Seattle. In addition to his salary he was given laundry service and allowed to use sponsorship accounts to trade for food. At the time "there was no wire service for radio news, so I arranged to buy a Seattle Star and rewrote the news for a 15-minute newscast every night. For \$10 a month." Estimates of Huntley's salary currently range from \$150,000 to \$200,000 annually.

In 1938 he went to CBS in Los Angeles, KNX, "because they began a genuine news network. I was correspondent for 11 western states." His salary during this period averaged about \$65 a week and he augmented it by being the voice on scores of movie trailers, and by introducing dance bands on late-night broadcasts. During the war years he covered the West Coast CBS. In 1951 he became ABC's man in Los Angeles. During his stay there he criticized the late Senator Joseph McCarthy and was denounced as a communist. He sued his detractor and won a \$10,000 judgment. "I never collected the

money. I didn't want it, but the judgment still stands to keep the party from opening her mouth again."

In 1955 Huntley switched to NBC. "There was no specific assignment. I was just a staff correspondent." In the summer of 1956, he and David Brinkley were selected to anchor the Democratic Presidential convention in Chicago and the Republican convention in San Francisco. "The Huntley-Brinkley Report" began Oct. 29, 1956. Stop! Okay, TV buffs, whom did H-B replace? Give up? John Cameron Swayze, "hop-scotching the world for headlines."

Only recently was it learned, and it came as a surprise to Huntley, that he was third choice for the network news. Novelist John Hersey had turned down an NBC offer, and Henry Cabot Lodge was suggested before the NBC brass settled on Huntley. Over the years the H-B team became subjects for spoof and parody, their "Good nights" to each were mimicked, as were their voices. Both men maintain that their 15-year "marriage" has been happy, despite NBC insiders' reports that the men often bridled at each other. Says Chet: "We're both adults. We've never pretended that we have to travel in tandem," but, he maintains, "We've never had a harsh word."

A visible split came in 1967. The American Federation of Television and Radio Artists struck the television networks on March 29. Brinkley stayed away from work. Chet went through the Rockefeller Center picket lines and went to work. There was much bitterness as a result. Several staff writers refused to work with Huntley and were transferred to other programs. Huntley refused to honor the AFTRA picket line, despite threats of fines and union sanctions.

Huntley felt, he says, "that AFTRA didn't represent me. Newsmen just don't belong in there with actors, singers, dancers and announcers, and I wasn't about to stand still and be pushed around. I had to carry an AFTRA card to be on programs as an entertainer, like the Carson show, or the Como show. I didn't have to join AFTRA to be a journalist, and I was damned if they were going to push me into anything." Oddly enough, his feelings were shared by one of the men who will succeed him, Frank McGee, who also worked during the strike. Huntley says the time was especially difficult for him. "My home [an East Side brownstone] was picketed. Windows were broken. I got threatening phone calls and mail." Of late, he says, "people who then hated my guts have come to me and said 'You were so right.'"

Shortly afterward, Huntley was forced to sell 350 head of pedigreed breeding cattle and to close up a southern New Jersey farm because of rifle sniping and vandalism to the herd and to his ranch. He admits that "sometimes I guess it's just because I'm me" that there are attacks, "but it's part of the business."

In 1968 NBC was rebuked by the Federal Communications Commission for permitting Huntley to deliver on-the-air attacks on Federal meat inspection requirements while he had interests in a cattle feeding farm. Huntley is bitter over this. "They picked up a Jack Gould story. He said why didn't I start my report with a disclaimer. Damn! I owned one per cent of a feeding company. Does that mean that everybody who has a piece of stock in a company must issue disclaimers if he is to speak about related subjects? I don't see Congressmen filing disclaimers. I can't subscribe to that."

Huntley's name has, from time to time, been brought up as a Senatorial possibility from Montana. "Six years ago there was talk that it was going to be Mike's [Mansfield] last term. I did poke around, and found out Mike changed his mind and was going to run. That settled it for me. You'd be an idiot to run against Mansfield in Montana." Would he have run as a Democrat? "I guess

so, although I'm a registered independent. I don't subscribe to the ideology of either party."

Huntley is realistic about his role as a commentator. "TV journalism is group journalism," he says. "It doesn't cover all the news. It's not the papers. We transmit the top." He does, however, regard himself and his NBC colleagues—"there were 75 people working here in 1955, now there are 1,000"—as "newsmen, not entertainers." He is impatient with "new" ways to do television news, such as having panels and discussions within news programs. "There's one good way, and that's to sit a guy down and have him read the news."

His optimism for television as a news-conveying medium dips when Vice President Agnew's name is mentioned. "He knew clearly what he was doing. People were disturbed by adverse news. Of course, what was the response from the Government? Let's get those guys, instead of trying to get rid of the aberrations and disturbances."

"Agnew assembled a big pool of discontent, and there seems to be a willingness to delete many provisions of the Bill of Rights if need be. You know it here in our shop. Every guy who sits down at a typewriter knows Agnew is tapping on his shoulder." Huntley adds, "Nixon is playing the whole thing like a virtuoso. I have a feeling we haven't heard it all from him yet."

He hopes he'll hear Agnew less in Montana when he goes there in a year with his wife, Tipton. Huntley has two daughters, Sharon and Leanne, by his first wife. He'll be in Manhattan rounding up backing for Big Sky for a year after he leaves NBC, and he'll be doing a syndicated television commentary, it is reported, for Horizon Communications Corporation, of which he is part owner and which operates two Long Island TV stations.

And after the year?

"I'm going to be on the Gallatin River working off a lot of spleen with a fishing pole."

THE FITZGERALD CASE: IS THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT COVERING FOR THE AIR FORCE?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, 225 days have passed since I wrote the Department of Justice seeking an investigation of the intimidation and firing of Mr. A. Ernest Fitzgerald by the Air Force. This case is a sad chapter in the history of the U.S. Air Force; it is rapidly becoming a sad chapter in the history of the Justice Department too.

It is clear that the Federal Criminal Code was violated when the Air Force fired Mr. Fitzgerald. Can there be any question about this when the code makes it a crime, punishable by up to 5 years in jail, to "injure" a witness on account of testifying before a congressional committee?

The only question to be determined is: Who in the Air Force made the decision to let Mr. Fitzgerald go? I am totally at a loss to understand how it can take 225 days to come up with an answer to this question.

Mr. President, is the Justice Department covering up for the Air Force? One begins to wonder.

THE CONTRIBUTION TO THE HEALTH OF MAN MADE BY VETERINARY MEDICINE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the University of Minnesota has a college of veterinary medicine of which we are immensely proud.

But few people, I think, have an appreciation of the very real contribution which veterinary medicine makes to man, not only indirectly through increasing the productivity of his livestock and the health of his pets, but directly through the eradication of many diseases which are carried by animals and which are fatal or injurious to man.

Dr. William Thorp, dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine of the University of Minnesota, recently revealed to me the significant contribution made by his field working in conjunction with all other health professions toward greater health care for our entire society. This is a contribution which we must recognize and which we must further in providing generous support to research in veterinary medicine.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the RECORD. His testimony before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies on June 16 elaborates upon these points. I commend it to anyone who wishes to give the matter further study.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA,
COLLEGE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE,
St. Paul, Minn., June 12, 1970.

HON. WALTER F. MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: In my present position at the University of Minnesota as Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine as well as chairman of the Joint Committee on Education for the American Veterinary Medical Association and the Association of Veterinary Medical Colleges I am very much concerned about the recommendations of the Executive branch of the government specifically President Nixon's recommendation this last February that \$3,000,000 would be saved by phasing out Federal institutional grants for Veterinary Medicine. These grants are very important to these institutions in meeting the Health Manpower needs of this country. Further, I am concerned that this philosophy will extend to other grants for which Veterinary Medicine is eligible under the 1968 Health Manpower Act. There are already a large number of unfunded grants for teaching facilities not only for Veterinary Medicine but for all health professions.

As one has observed Veterinary Medicine and the profession over the past 35 years, it has gradually arrived at scientific maturity. I would refer to my experience in the U.S. Public Health Service while at the National Institutes of Health where I was concerned with those diseases of animals transmitted to man of which there are more than 100. Taking into consideration the diseases of animals transmitted to man and the importance of primary prevention of illness and disability, veterinarians have a particularly significant contribution to make to human health in terms of comparative medicine as well as controlling and eradicating diseases of animals which are transmitted to man.

As an example in 1950 more than 5000 human cases of brucellosis were reported in the United States. It appeared that the only way to substantially reduce the disease in man was to reduce or eliminate the diseases in animals. Through the combined efforts of veterinarians, physicians, and health scientists, a program was established aimed at the eradication of the disease in cattle and swine populations. In 1969 in the United

States, as a result of a reduction of this disease in the animal population, less than 300 cases of brucellosis were reported in man. This is but one example of how the veterinary medical profession, working with other members of the health teams, has contributed to the primary prevention of disease in man and the reduction of health care costs associated with demands upon the hospitals and the health care personnel of the country. This also helped to prevent the mental anguish, physical pain, the pre-treatment disability, and the loss of productivity of the men and women affected by this disease.

Another example of primary prevention in man is associated with the program to eradicate bovine tuberculosis and the accompanying reduction of the transmission of the disease to children and men and women in the population. There are other examples which could be given as we continually work in the field of comparative medicine where the veterinary profession plays an important part. We are finding more and more diseases occurring in animals that are models of disease in man. A good example is bovine leukemia. Minnesota and several other institutions are working on this problem using bovine leukemia as a model system to study the disease as a comparative medical problem that will help to solve the problem in humans.

The May 29, 1970 issue of Science AAAS carried a report on "Feline Leukemia and Sarcoma Viruses: Susceptibility of Human Cells to Infection". The following is of interest: "We have recently found that cultured human embryonic cells are extremely susceptible to infection with newly isolated field strains of leukemia and sarcoma viruses of the cat. The leukemia and sarcoma viruses thus propagated in human cells are fully infectious for human, dog, and cat embryonic cells." "Although there is not evidence to implicate feline leukemia and sarcoma viruses in human cancer, further studies are necessary to determine the possible occurrence of some horizontal spread of cancer by this mode."

The reduction or elimination of Veterinary Medicine from health manpower programs developed for the purpose of increasing the health manpower would take away an important, but not always clearly understood, link in the health chain in the total effort to provide a better national health.

I sincerely appreciate your support in the past and your consideration of this very critical matter as far as our part of the health program is concerned.

Sincerely,

W. T. S. THORP, D.V.M.,
Dean.

HOW CHINA CURBS STUDENT REBELS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, for the benefit of those—and there are some—who still are not aware of what happens to students who dare question the policies of a Communist government, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the New York Times of June 18 be printed in the RECORD. I believe no additional comment is necessary.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINA TIGHTENS CURBS ON STUDENT REBELS

HONG KONG, June 17.—Communist China, which has enthusiastically endorsed the anti-Establishment activities of young people around the world, is adopting increasingly repressive measures against its own student rebels.

Chinese authorities have been calling for greater efforts in the indoctrination of young children "to raise their class awareness" and

"to deepen their love" for Mao Tse-tung, chairman of the Chinese Communist party.

The aging Peking leader's preoccupation with the younger generation appears to reflect a continuing concern that the present political system might not endure when they step down. They are attempting to foster generations of "revolutionary successors," who will not succumb to the "sugar-coated bullets" of enemies at home or abroad.

A recent public meeting at Changchun, capital of Kirin Province, was told by a municipal official that class enemies were "trying by every means to win over to their side the young people and children."

MUST OBEY UNQUESTIONINGLY

"Imperialist conspirators also pin their hopes for a peaceful evolution on our young generation," he said. "It is imperative for us to smash this illusion of the imperialists."

In these circumstances, the young must follow Peking's edicts unquestioningly. Posters seen recently by travelers in China stated: "Decisively liquidate bad elements who fan the wind of criminal opposition among the youth."

A large proportion of the many hundreds recently executed in Kwangtung Province for various alleged crimes were young people. Many of them were students who had rebelled against being sent to work in the countryside and had turned to crime to feed themselves.

Most high school graduates are expected to undergo "reeducation" at the hands of the peasants. Millions have been sent from cities and towns to the countryside. In this way, the Chinese authorities have removed potential or known rebellious elements from the centers of power, reduced the urban population pressures and increased the rural labor force.

Hsinhua, the Chinese press agency, reported that "several million graduates from senior and junior middle schools" had settled down in the countryside since December, 1968. The students are expected to spend the rest of their lives with the peasants.

SOME SWIM TO HONG KONG

The campaign has met with persistent resistance. Many refugees who swim to Hong Kong are former students who were sent from Canton, capital of Kwangtung Province, to work in the countryside.

Many students from Canton and other urban areas in Kwangtung have been assigned to Hainan Island. A broadcast from Hainan Island recently complained that some workers "brought all kinds of nonproletarian ideas from their old schools."

It stated: "Some said: 'To study in school for over 10 years and to work as a dockerman is a waste of our talents.' Others feared hardship and fatigue."

The broadcast said that "class education" and study of the works of Chairman Mao "proved highly effective" in overcoming these tendencies and other anarchist trends."

For the very young, a new program of "red children's classes" has been introduced "to cultivate their children into successors to the proletarian revolutionary cause" by giving them daily doses of Mao's thought.

FIVE-YEAR-OLD IS EXAMPLE

A broadcast from Hefei, capital of Anhwei Province, reporting on the results of these classes, said a 5-year-old boy from a certain peasant production team used to pick up rice from the field and take it home.

The broadcast stated: "After attending the red children's class, he has come to realize that to take home the team's crops means acting from self-interest. With this new understanding in mind, he has not brought home any more crops picked up from the fields."

Hsinhua also had high praise for five children ranging in age from 10 to 15 who "died heroically in the course of putting out a forest fire."

"People saw them run into the flames and heard them recite Chairman Mao's great teaching 'When we die for the people it is a worthy death,'" the agency said.

"In an instant, the five young heroes were surrounded by the conflagration, but people still heard shouts of 'Long live Chairman Mao!' loud and clear."

URGENCY OF PRESERVING THE BIG THICKET, A PROPOSED NATIONAL PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, concerned citizens are becoming more and more alarmed at the destruction of our areas of great natural beauty.

The Big Thicket of southeast Texas is such an area, and has unique scientific and esthetic values.

An excellent article on the Big Thicket by Dorthie Erwin appeared in the June 21, 1970, issue of the Dallas Morning News, on page 12-A, under the title "Time Running Out on Big Thicket Backers." This is one of the most outstanding articles ever published in any newspaper about the effort to preserve the Big Thicket. The substance of the article is superior, and the coverage given to this important issue is timely and worthy of study by every person who believes in saving the remaining undestroyed natural wonders in this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME RUNNING OUT FOR BIG THICKET BACKERS (By Dorthie Erwin)

"The question now comes, is the Big Thicket to pass into legend . . . or is this area to be protected and made available to those who enjoy the study of animate nature . . . Already the thinking people of Texas and the nation have decreed that the Big Thicket must be protected . . . An early acquisition of the property is desirable . . ."

These quotes are from a report of a biological survey by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station in 1936. The first serious scientific investigations were being made of the wet woodlands of Southeast Texas which were already famous in lore and literature from the time of the earliest southwestward migrations.

The same pleas were made at the recent Senate subcommittee hearings in Beaumont on a proposed Big Thicket national park—but the passage of 34 years and the shrinkage of the thicket have given the arguments an ironic tone and a very shrill note of urgency.

The thicket spread over perhaps a million and a half acres in the 1930s. It is more like 300,000 acres now, and real estate developments, farming, logging and drainage imperil what is left of the unique biological community.

Nowhere in the national park system is there a piece of the once-vast southern hardwood forest—"and it is unthinkable that we would ignore a chance to save some representation of this forest," Dr. Donovan Correll, Texas Research Institute botanist testified.

A thicket park is nearer to reality than ever before, some of the park proponents thought after the hearing. They had put their strongest arguments to Sen. Alan Bible of Nevada, whose parks and recreations subcommittee (of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs) will consider a park bill introduced by Sen. Ralph Yarborough.

Sen. Bible and National Park Service Director George B. Hartzog Jr. toured parts of the thicket after the hearing.

The Park Service will review the park potential and make a recommendation for the subcommittee at Bible's request.

Meanwhile, Interior Secretary Walter Hickel has expressed a strong personal interest in seeing the thicket preserved.

But the park is no cinch. It still needs concerted effort by Texans and national conservation organizations.

Some questions are yet to be answered—the size and cost of the park, and the compatibility of recreational use with preservation of its unique ecology for serious scientific study.

Either of two proposed plans would create a park of unusual configuration. There is not enough thicket left for a single continuous park.

A Park Service study team in 1967 prepared a plan for preserving nine separate natural areas, each botanically unique, in what was called a "string of pearls." Rep. John Dowdy, in whose district the park would lie, introduced a bill in the House to preserve the "pearls," comprising about 35,500 acres (or 55 square miles).

The largest area is the Big Thicket profile unit of about 18,000 acres. Other units are much smaller, ranging down to 50 acres.

The Texas Forestry Association and the lumber companies which own most of the land in question are supporting this concept.

Sen. Yarborough's bill, however, calls for a park of at least 100,000 acres.

The conservationist organizations which are allied in the Big Thicket Coordinating Committee support this plan, saying the natural specimen areas are too small to survive alone and that the park should include the "string" to connect the pearls. The larger acreage would take in environmental corridors along the streams and highways between the pearls.

The conservationists also urge preservation of the Saratoga-Kountze-Sour Lake triangle and the entire lower Neches River floodplain as wildlife areas, for restoration and protection of native animals and ultimately for restocking of game in outlying areas.

And they want the overall area designated an environmental conservation zone, in which logging, grazing and hunting would continue, within conservation concepts.

All of Hardin County and parts of four adjacent counties are in the zone. The Alabama-Coushatta Indian Reservation is at its northwest corner.

The corridors and natural specimen areas would amount to almost 100,000 acres, and the triangle would add about 40,000 acres.

The conservationists think the specimen areas should be acquired in fee, and that financing could come from the U.S. Land and Water Conservation Fund if the administration will release funds now tied up. Some other areas might be acquired as easements.

Total cost is not known. Coordinating committee Chairman Orrin Bonney of Houston said recent land sales indicate a value of \$225 to \$350 an acre for the different natural specimen areas.

The triangle, long regarded as the heart of the thicket, has little habitation. The Neches bottoms are largely unused by man and are in almost natural condition. Preservation of this river corridor as park land would have little impact on resident or timber operations in the area but would enhance the park, Bonney told the senators.

The potential effect on the timber industry is the controversial issue. Timber rules the area's economy. Some residents have mixed emotions about the park, fearing their homes would be taken or their jobs lost or businesses harmed if logging and sawmill operations are curtailed.

Witnesses at the hearing repeated often-voiced charges that timber interests want to delay the park acquisition until there is no thicket left worth preserving, and that some have deliberately destroyed or wasted fine hardwood trees and sprayed heron rookeries with insecticides to reduce the area's appeal as a park.

Temple Industries President Arthur Temple of Diboll, one of the industry spokesmen, responded that if such wanton damage is being done, the perpetrators are smaller timber owners and not the large companies.

The few large firms which own more than half the acreage in the unique specimen units have refrained from cutting there ever since the Park Service designated them—"a moratorium that was an unprecedented demonstration of good corporate citizenship," he said.

He said his company recognizes its social responsibilities, but it also is responsible to its employees who depend on it for their livelihood.

"The ecological balance is a fragile thing . . . but our economic balance too often teeters on the same precipice," he said.

Stung by conservationists' criticism of the industry for "denuding" the thicket, he said: "When I hear our good city brothers from Houston and Dallas tell us how we have messed up the countryside, I can't help wondering who messed up those cities they are trying to escape from when they come out to our poor denuded forests."

The argument of Sen. Yarborough and other large-park proponents is that it would help, not harm, the area's economy.

Southeast Texas would get "a new crop of tourists each year without damage to the area, instead of having to wait 10 years for a timber crop to grow," the senator said. The alternative, he said, is to be "condemned to a virtually no-growth timber economy." The area is not sharing in the state's general economic growth because of its dependence on one product which creates few new jobs, he added.

Other park partisans think the timber men are objecting to the larger acreage on principle rather than from fear of real harm to the industry. They say much of the extra land is stream bottoms not especially good for lumber production, and some areas would have to be drained before timber could be harvested.

Yarborough says the park would comprise only 3.3 per cent of the acreage of the counties affected.

"We don't want to put their pine plantations in the park," he stressed repeatedly.

Temple urges that the government buy only the "pearls" and not acquire "more land than can properly be used as a botanical laboratory." But the weight of scientific testimony at the hearing was that the specimen areas will not survive unless protected by buffer areas. Nearby development would starve them by altering drainage, witnesses said.

Selective harvesting of timber will not destroy the thicket, several witnesses agreed. The forest will renew itself if growing conditions remain stable.

("Don't worry about timber being taken now," Dr. Correll advised. "Get some of this cut-over land . . . This park is for our children!")

But the subcommittee heard a stern warning from naturalist Geraldine Watson of Silsbee, a trail guide in the thicket: "Water is its lifeblood . . . Any plan which doesn't preserve the waterways is little more than a farce."

And the real threat to the thicket, she believes, is "the forest industry's plan to convert its holdings to pine plantations at a rate of 30,000 acres a year. These are biological deserts, controlled by pesticides and herbicides."

Furthermore, said North Texas State University philosophy professor Dr. Peter Gunter, a new "soil-shredding" technique in forestry makes possible "total obliteration" of the ecology.

"We can learn more about the natural environment from the Big Thicket than from any area of comparable size in the United States," he said. "Does it make sense to dismantle this laboratory now when we are just beginning to grasp its significance?"

"Our future as a species depends on such knowledge as areas such as the Big Thicket can supply."

E. C. "Ned" Fritz of Dallas spoke for the Texas Committee on Natural Resources and the Nature Conservancy Inc.: The isolated natural areas (a string of green "emeralds" rather than "pearls," he suggested) would be vulnerable to urban and commercial encroachment and are too small to permit public use for camping or hunting.

Connecting waterways, on the other hand, would serve recreational purposes while embracing the specimen areas in buffer zones. For float trips, canoe trips and primitive camping, they would provide a "wilderness experience." They would also facilitate the park's educational, interpretive mission, by showing the role that streams play in the creation of the thicket.

The Thicket's appeal brought two longtime political foes—Yarborough and former governor and senator Price Daniel—into rare accord. Both were born and reared in the area and hunted in the thicket (separately) as boys.

At the hearing, Daniel said that as governor he had tried hard to persuade the state park board and the Legislature in the early 1960s that it was Texas' responsibility to save the thicket—"but the Legislature did nothing."

"The longer we wait, the less of this bounty of nature we are going to have for preservation," Daniel said, endorsing Yarborough's bill.

The bounty he spoke of is the uniquely rich and diverse plant and animal life in what is often called the "biological crossroads of North America." The climate and soil conditions permit overlapping of temperate and subtropical vegetation. The thicket contains elements common to the Everglades, the Okefenokee swamp, the Appalachian region, the Piedmont forests and the open woodlands of the coastal plains.

Birds, reptiles, fungi and rare plants abound. Several species of trees have reached champion size there. Environmental ecology students can observe most of the plant communities of the United States within a small area.

If Texas does get its third national park in the thicket, Dallas will have an important stake in it. Nearer than the Big Bend and Guadalupe Parks, the wilderness "emeralds" will be within an easy morning's drive and will offer a recreational experience completely different from that of the western parks or the Padre Island national seashore.

The hearing record remains open until June 26 for further written statements or rebuttal. The next step, Bible says, will be consideration of the bill after the Interior Department has made its recommendation.

Yarborough, speaking to the annual meeting of the Big Thicket Association in Saratoga, said he would keep working for the park "in office and out." His term ends this year.

He urged the park proponents to "talk to every congressman you know."

"Get them committed to their public for this work, and we'll have it," he said.

AN EXAMPLE OF COURAGE AND LOYALTY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, you may recall that several weeks ago a number

of Senators spoke in the Chamber with deep feeling about their reaction after having met Mrs. Bruce G. Johnson, the wife of an Air Force major who has been missing in Vietnam for 5 years. He was nearly ready to return home, having already completed nearly a year's duty in that area, when he was captured by the North Vietnamese Army.

Since that date she has had no word of him or from him. He has simply disappeared into limbo. Her children have not seen their father for 6 years and their youngest child, now 7, has no knowledge of what it is like to have a father. By sheer strength of her own loyalty and devotion, she is keeping him alive in their hearts as their father and family head.

The tragic humiliation through which Mrs. Johnson is passing and under which she has lived for 5 years can neither be appreciated nor understood by someone who has not experienced it. For 5 years she has been without her husband. Her children have been without a father. She does not know whether he is alive or dead. She does not know whether she is a wife or widow. She does not know whether to go on hoping for a better future, or give up and try to remake her life under a new set of circumstances. As of now, because of her situation, she is barred from all the regular adjustments which society and our culture have made possible for women who lose their husbands. She cannot borrow money without special action because, of course, her husband cannot sign the note with her. She cannot buy a house for her growing family without special arrangement. She cannot dispose of property which is in their joint names. She cannot remarry—not that she would want to so far as I know—even though she may indeed be 5 years a widow.

Mrs. Johnson and the other women in this position have suffered far more than anyone should be made to suffer. It is true that they have our Nation's sympathy and compassion. But in this particular case, at least, I wish to point out that she and some of the others are worthy of our boundless admiration as well.

A month ago I had occasion to send Mrs. Johnson a little booklet made up of excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing that every day the Senate had met since her visit, notice was taken on the floor of our Chamber of the plight of prisoners of war held by our enemies. A few days ago I received a reply from Mrs. Johnson. It was such a heart-warming, dignified, courageous reply that it should be read and pondered by every thinking person in our country.

Mrs. Johnson and the other ladies like her are heroines in the truest and highest sense. We extend to them our boundless love, sympathy, and admiration and wish it were possible to do something, other than speak words, to alleviate the suffering which they are undergoing.

Mr. President, later on, when this problem has finally been resolved, Congress may feel called upon to make some special recognition of the sacrifices made by these women and the penalties they have endured at their country's behest. I know not what that recognition might

or should consist of, nor what, indeed, we could properly do even to begin to assuage the pain and travail they have undergone. But do something we should; and do something, I feel certain, we shall. Mere words of comfort are easy, but they signify little in the face of a claim to our sympathy so great as this.

Mr. President, the letter which Mrs. Johnson has written to me is so outstanding an example of the high qualities of devotion, self-abnegation, and steadfast courage under adversity that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALINA, KANS., June 28, 1970.

HON. GORDON ALLOTT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ALLOTT: Earlier this month I was so pleased and encouraged to receive your letter of May 26, 1970 and the enclosures of the copies of speeches appearing in the Congressional Record as they pertain to America's Missing in Action and Prisoners of War. Thank you so much for your thoughtfulness in compiling these statements and for your sharing them with me in this way. Please convey to each Member of the Policy Committee and to each of the Senators who had attended that Tuesday Policy luncheon, my heartfelt thanks and gratefulness for their concern and for their initiative in making the plight of these, Our Men, a matter of priority each time the Senate of Our Land meets. I'm sure each of you already senses how desperately we wives, children, and parents look to you in the Senate, as well as to all our other elected Representatives and Officials, for the leadership, determination, effort and "caring" that would call for and bring about humane treatment for our beloved husbands, fathers and sons.

May God keep all of our hearts sensitive to these calls of human needs that still remain unanswered in the Prison Camps of Southeast Asia—the calls that only echo back into the ears of those who wait in the isolation cells of North Vietnam. May our hearts be sensitive too, to the echo of that call that returns void and unheard back to the deep jungle prison camps that engulf our men held in the South and may our hearts be attuned to those muffled pleas that arise from American men held in the prison pits of Laos.

These cries of Our Men are heard by loving hearts that prayerfully wait in so many homes across America—they are heard throughout endless days that stretch into month and years. They are heard in the night by little children who reach out to their fathers through dreams. They are heard by wives who spend sleepless nights sharing the long vigil of sorrow and loneliness with their husbands. They are heard by parents who yearn to return each night to the side of that son. They are heard by their Creator Who does grant strength and Courage and Hope.

I know too, that those cries will not return to them void, from the Senate of the United States—that sensitive hearts will hear and care and continue to act until these faithful Americans are granted humane rights as Prisoners and until that day of their return to us.

Sincerely,

KATHLEEN B. JOHNSON.

MILITARY SURVEILLANCE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, earlier this year I called the attention of

the Senate to an article written by Christopher Pyle for the January issue of the Washington Monthly on the Army's CONUS intelligence program, designed to collect information on civilian political activities.

Along with others, I was considerably disturbed by the Army's involvement in surveillance of civilian political groups. I was one of several Senators who wrote to the Secretary of the Army on this subject.

Now, 6 months after his original article, Mr. Pyle has taken another look at the CONUS intelligence program in an article published in the July issue of the Washington Monthly. Mr. Pyle's article begins:

The Army still watches civilian politics. Despite over 50 Congressional inquiries, the threat of House and Senate hearings, and a lawsuit by the American Civil Liberties Union, more than 1,000 plainclothes soldiers continue to monitor the political activities of law-abiding citizens.

Mr. President, I feel that these activities are clearly outside the proper sphere of the Army, and it is particularly distressing that the Army is apparently continuing some of these activities despite earlier denials.

Among the points made by Mr. Pyle in the article are these:

1. The blanket surveillance of civilian political activity by the Army, cut back in January, has resumed.
2. Non-computerized regional data banks on dissenters remain at field, region and headquarter offices of the Army Intelligence Command.
3. The Army intelligence reports continue to go to the FBI and to the Justice Department's interdivisional intelligence unit.
4. New security measures make public scrutiny of the Intelligence Command more difficult.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Pyle's article, entitled "CONUS Revisited: The Army Covers Up," and an article on the same subject written by Morton Kondracke of the Chicago Sun-Times, and published in the Washington Star of March 28, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONUS REVISITED: THE ARMY COVERS UP
(By Christopher H. Pyle)

The Army still watches civilian politics. Despite over 50 Congressional inquiries, the threat of House and Senate hearings, and a lawsuit by the American Civil Liberties Union, more than 1,000 plainclothes soldiers continue to monitor the political activities of law-abiding citizens.

Some reforms have occurred since this blanket surveillance was first revealed in the January issue of this magazine. The Army has admitted that its CONUS (Continental U.S.) intelligence program exceeded its needs in preparing for riots and has agreed to cut it back. It has also promised to destroy two widely circulated "blacklists" on dissenters and to scrap its computerized data banks containing records on the membership, ideology, programs, and practices of virtually every activist political group in the country, from the violence-prone Weathermen to the non-violent Urban League. Important as these reforms are, however, they are deceptive.

THE FIRST PLAUSIBLE DENIALS

When *The Washington Monthly* reached the newsstands on January 9, the Army high command dived for cover. The Pentagon's office of Public Information refused to comment. Reporters were told to submit their questions in writing. From its headquarters at Fort Holabird in Baltimore, the Army Intelligence Command flashed orders to each of its intelligence groups limiting the collection of domestic intelligence to only the most "essential elements of information." Agents were forbidden to discuss any aspect of the program with newsmen and were warned that any who did would be prosecuted for breach of national security. From his office on the second floor of the Pentagon, Robert E. Jordan III, Army General Counsel and Special Assistant to the Secretary for Civil Functions, suspended all replies to Congressional inquiries. In violation of its own regulations, the Army even refused to acknowledge receipt of them.

By the end of the month, however, the rising tide of criticism could not be ignored. Recognizing this, the Army issued, on January 26, the first in a series of partial admissions. In the jargon of the spy trade, such admissions are known as "plausible denials," because they are invested with just enough truth to mask an essential falsehood. Thus the Army confirmed the existence of the nationwide intelligence apparatus (true), but said that it collected political intelligence only "in connection with Army civil disturbance responsibilities" (false). "Civil disturbance incident reports are transmitted over [an] . . . automatic voice network teletype system to the U.S. Army Intelligence Command headquarters" (true) and "information on incidents by types and geographical location is placed in the data bank from key-punched cards" (also true). But: "This is incident information only and does not include individual biographies or personality data" (false).

The statement also acknowledged that the Army "does publish an identification list, sometimes with photos, of persons who have been active in past civil disturbance activity" (true), but failed to mention that the list (actually a booklet) also contained detailed descriptions of persons and organizations never involved in civil disturbances.

Finally, the Army admitted in a backhanded way that its agents had infiltrated civilian political groups: "For some time there has been a special prohibition against military persons undertaking such activities as undercover operations in the civilian community." Of course, it did not say when the order was issued, or whether it was being obeyed. (It is not.)

The "plausible denials" satisfied no one. Inquiries directed to the Secretary of the Army, Stanley R. Resor, poured forth from both Houses of Congress. Legislators of such diverse persuasions as Senators Williams of Delaware, Hart of Michigan, Dole of Kansas, Brooke of Massachusetts, Percy of Illinois, Fulbright of Arkansas, and Cook of Kentucky demanded to know if the charges were true and, if so, by what authority and for what purpose the Army was spying on law-abiding citizens.

Congressman Cornelius E. Gallagher (D-N.J.), Chairman of the House Invasion of Privacy Subcommittee, and Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr. (D-N.C.), Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, led the attack. Gallagher wrote to Secretary Resor on January 26: "I am deeply concerned about the implications of collecting dossiers on Americans who are pursuing constitutionally protected activities, especially when they are to be imbedded in immediately available form in a computerized data system."

Senator Ervin, a member of the Armed Services Committee and a former judge, was more outspoken: "The Army," he said in a

Senate speech on February 2, "has no business operating data banks for the surveillance of private citizens; nor do they have any business in domestic politics."

When the Army continued to avoid inquiries during the month of February, however, members of Congress expressed annoyance at being ignored. Congressman Gallagher, usually a staunch friend of the military, was especially fed up. After waiting over two weeks for the Army to acknowledge his letter, he threatened to hold hearings.

Still the Army stalled for time. It had good reason. Like Congress and the public, its civilian hierarchy first learned of the Intelligence Command's unbridled curiosity from the press. Unable to learn more from the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence, who greatly downplayed the CONUS system's capabilities, the civilians resolved to conduct their own inquiry. This reached a point of revelation sometime in mid-February when Army General Counsel Jordan went to Fort Holabird and watched as the computer bank on dissenters disgorged a lengthy print-out on Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr.

On February 25, Jordan dispatched the Army's first reply to more than 30 Congressional critics. Each received the same letter, regardless of the questions he had asked. It opened with a lengthy defense of the Intelligence Command's library of security clearance dossiers—never at issue—and closed with a brief confession: "There have been some activities which have been undertaken in the civil disturbance field which, on review, have been determined to be beyond the Army's mission requirements."

"For example, the Intelligence Command published . . . an identification list which included the names and descriptions of individuals who might become involved in civil disturbance situations." And: "The Intelligence Command has operated a computer data bank . . . which included information about potential incidents and individuals involved in potential civil disturbance incidents."

Jordan assured members of Congress that both the identification list and the data bank had been ordered destroyed. "Thus," he concluded, "the Army does not currently maintain the identification list referred to above. No computer data bank of civil disturbance information is being maintained . . ."

Again, the denials were both plausible and deceptive. Jordan's seemingly candid letter failed to mention that in addition to the Fort Holabird computer (an IBM 1401) and the Intelligence Command's identification list (published in over 330 copies), the Army also maintained:

(1) over 375 copies of a two-volume, loose-leaf encyclopedia on dissent entitled "Counterintelligence Research Project: Cities and Organizations of Interest and Individuals of Interest" but popularly known as "the Compendium." Compiled by the domestic intelligence section of the Counterintelligence Analysis Division (CIAD), a Pentagon-based unit responsible for briefing high Army officials like Jordan on protest politics, the Compendium contained descriptions of hundreds of organizations and individuals, including the John Birch Society, the Urban League, the Fifth Avenue Peace Parade Committee, Negro playwright LeRoi Jones, and the late Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.

(2) a computer-indexed, microfilm archive of intelligence reports, newspaper clippings, and other records of political protests and civil disturbances at CIAD headquarters in Alexandria, Virginia. The index to this data bank is a computer print-out, 50 lines to a page, a foot-and-a-half thick. It catalogues microfilmed documents relating to such groups as Young Americans for Freedom, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions. Individuals listed include Rear

Admiral Arnold E. True and Brigadier General Hugh B. Hester (war critics), Georgia State Representative Julian Bond, and folk singers Joan Baez, Phil Ochs, and Arlo Guthrie.

(3) a computerized data bank on civil disturbances, political protests, and "resistance in the Army (RITA)" at the Continental Army Command headquarters, Fort Monroe, Virginia. The civil disturbance-political protest side of this data bank was developed because the Continental Army Command hoped to recapture supervision of its riot control troops from the Pentagon's special 180-man Directorate for Civil Disturbance Planning and Operations.

(4) non-computerized regional data banks at each stateside Army command and at many military installations. In addition to the usual agent reports, incident reports, and newspaper clippings, these records include booklet-size "CONUS intelligence summaries" published each month by the 1st, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and 6th Armies, and the Military District of Washington.

(5) non-computerized files at most of the Intelligence Command's 300 stateside intelligence group offices. These records on local political groups and individuals are similar to, but more detailed than, the records at Fort Holabird which the Army promised to destroy. The political files of the 108th Military Intelligence Group's Manhattan offices, for example, take up five four-drawer file cabinets and require a full-time custodian.

Congressional reactions to Jordan's admissions, omissions, and denials were mixed. Congressman Gallagher—although fully aware of the omissions—seemed pleased. Without withdrawing his threat of hearings, he announced to the press that the Army would no longer keep tabs on peaceful demonstrations or publish a list of individuals who might be involved in a riot. His announcement, repeated in interviews over the weekend, became the basis of widespread and erroneous newspaper reports. *The New York Times* of February 27 was typical: "Army Ends Watch on Civil Protests." Gallagher got the credit for the apparent victory.

Other members of Congress were slower to react and before they did Morton Kondracke of *The Chicago Sun-Times* reported on February 28: "The Army acknowledged yesterday that it maintains files on the political activities of civilians other than the computerized political data bank it told Congressmen it was closing down." Kondracke, a thorough reporter, listed them all.

The following Monday, Senator Ervin expressed his dissatisfaction with Jordan's letter. In a letter to the Secretary of the Army he reiterated his demand for a complete report to Congress, and in a Senate floor speech denounced the surveillance as a "usurpation of authority." "The business of the Army in [civil disturbance] . . . situations is to know about the conditions of highways, bridges, and facilities. It is not to predict trends and reactions by keeping track of the thoughts and actions of Americans exercising first amendment freedoms."

"If there ever were a case of military overkill," he added, "this is it. . . I suggest the Army regroup and define its strategic objectives, lower its sights, and reidentify its enemy. Under our Constitution that enemy is not the American citizen."

THE ARMY REGROUPS

Within the Army, much regrouping was already going on. A letter received by Congressman Gallagher from sources close to the 116th Military Intelligence Group at Fort McNair in Washington, D.C., described what was happening at the lower echelons:

"On the morning after news reports about the dismantling of the CONUS system first appeared in the Washington papers . . . members of the 116th were . . . informed that their unit and its operations would be

unaffected. . . . They were told that the only major effect of the Congressional and press criticism would be destruction of the national data bank and related files that were kept at Fort Holabird. Files kept by the regional M.I. Groups (which were the basis for the Fort Holabird file and contained more information) would remain intact, and members of the M.I. Groups would continue their operations of surveillance, infiltration, and reporting as previously.

"In addition, all files and operations of the 116th were to be classified to prevent the release of any information about them; disclosure of such information would subject people who released that information to court-martial or prosecution in civilian court for violation of national security.

"At the present time, the files of the 116th M.I. Group consist of a 5x7 card file on several thousand persons in the Washington area. On these cards are a picture of each person, background, a record of political groups with which he has been affiliated, notes on political meetings, rallies, and demonstrations which he has attended, and summaries of his views on political issues.

"To gather such information, the 116th routinely assigns some 20 of its men as full-time undercover agents to infiltrate political groups and observe politically active persons . . . Some of these officers have grown beards and long hair to pass as students on local college campuses. In addition, other members pose as members of the working press to obtain pictures of those involved in political activities; concealed tape recorders are also commonly used to record speeches and conversations at political events. Until very recently the 116th's standard equipment also included a full TV videotape camera and sound truck labeled 'Mid-West News' which was used to record major demonstrations."

Higher up the chain of command, officials at Fort Holabird also balked at carrying out the new policy. Questioned by Joseph Hanlon of *Computerworld* on March 10, an Intelligence Command spokesman refused to say whether the computer tapes there had actually been erased or merely placed in storage. He admitted, however, that the "input" to the data bank (presumably the keypunch cards) had not been destroyed.

Higher still, the civilians supposedly in charge of the Army struggled to find out what their military subordinates were doing. Robert Jordan, surprised by the *Washington Monthly* article and by his pilgrimage to the Fort Holabird computer, was taken aback once more on February 27 during a conference with Congressman Gallagher. Asked why his letter made no mention of the microfilm archives at CIAD, he replied: "I'll have to check into that."

To help Jordan out, Secretary Resor wrote to the Army Chief of Staff, General William C. Westmoreland, on March 5: "I would appreciate your asking all commanders in CONUS, Alaska, and Hawaii down to the installation level to report whether their command has any form of computerized data bank relating to civilians or civilian activities, other than data banks dealing with routine administrative matters. . . ."

THE UNDER SECRETARY TRIES HIS HAND

The results of this canvass have not been made known, but on March 20 Under Secretary of the Army Thaddeus R. Beal wrote long letters to both Ervin and Gallagher. He claimed: "The only other 'intelligence files' concerning civilians maintained by the Army consist of the files maintained by the Counterintelligence Analysis Division."

No reference was made in either letter to: 1) the Continental Army Command's computer files at Fort Monroe, about which Gallagher had made specific inquiries; 2) the regional data banks kept by most of the 300 offices of the Army Intelligence Command;

or 3) similar records maintained by the G-2s (intelligence officers) of each stateside Army command and of many Army posts.

The microfilm archives at CIAD, Beal went on to say, contain only "limited files concerning political activity" in keeping with that unit's responsibility "for identifying factors which affect civil disturbance potential. . . ." He did not mention that these files take up over 200 rolls of microfilm, at 500 frames a roll. Nor did he acknowledge that the unit's domestic intelligence section, which is larger than any of its foreign intelligence sections, had charged its "left wing," "right wing," and "racial" desks with maintaining detailed card files on dissident individuals and groups. These files are in addition to mounds of current FBI and Army reports and newspaper clippings which are coded on key-punch cards (for the computerized index) and recorded on microfilm.

The Under Secretary's claim that the archive was used only in connection with civil disturbance planning was similarly misleading. According to former CIAD employees, one of the principal uses of this file—if not the main reason for its existence—has been to satisfy the curiosity of the Pentagon's brass. A not unusual assignment carried out by one domestic intelligence expert was to write an unclassified report on SDS for a general to send to his daughter at an exclusive Eastern women's college.

In addition to these "plausible denials," Beal also admitted that CIAD had compiled "an identification list . . . on individuals and organizations associated with civil disturbances." "This list," he contended, "was last updated in late [1969] true and is available to a limited number of Department of the Army organizations with civil disturbance responsibilities [false]." According to persons who helped compile it, the Compendium went out to over 150 Army intelligence and troop units, plus the FBI, the Justice Department, Naval and Air Force Intelligence, the CIA, and U.S. embassies in West Germany and Canada.

More important, Beal conceded that "the lists are now out of date, are not considered necessary. . . . [and] are being . . . destroyed . . ." In addition he promised that the Army would: 1) henceforth limit its curiosity to "incidents where there is a high potential for violence or disorder growing beyond the capability of state and local police and the National Guard to control;" and 2) destroy all existing computerized data banks on civilian politics.

No new computerized data banks, he said, would be established without the approval of both the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff after "consultations with concerned committees of Congress."

The concessions were substantial. To Congressman Gallagher, they were sufficient. "In view of the Army's commendable action in reversing its former policy," he announced, "I see no further need for a Congressional hearing at this time."

To Senator Ervin, on the other hand, Beal's assurances were plainly inadequate. Only the press of other matters, such as preventive detention, ball reform, and the Government Employees' Privacy Bill kept him from calling his subcommittee into session for a full-scale review of all government political data systems, starting with the Army's.

THE ACLU GOES TO COURT

While Congressmen and Senators struggled with the Army's evasions and deceptions, the civilian intelligence program was being attacked in the courts. On February 17 the American Civil Liberties Union filed suit in Federal District Court in Washington, D.C., against the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Army Chief of Staff, and the Commanding General of the Intelligence Command. The suit charged that the surveillance, data banks, and blacklists violated the Bill of Rights by reason of the chill-

ing effect which knowledge of their existence can have upon the willingness of citizens to exercise their freedoms of speech, press, and association and their right to petition the government for redress of grievances.

The plaintiffs were 13 individuals and organizations whose non-violent, lawful politics had been the subject of widely distributed Army reports. The first was Arlo Tatum, executive director of the Quaker-sponsored Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors in Philadelphia. An IBM card prepared for his computer file at Fort Holabird showed only that he had once delivered a speech at the University of Oklahoma on the legal rights of conscientious objectors. Other plaintiffs included Women's Strike for Peace, Veterans for Peace, Conrad Lynn, and the Reverend Albert Cleage, Jr.

Even before filing suit, the ACLU was aware that a cover-up might be attempted at the lower, as well as higher, echelons of the Army. This suspicion was confirmed by the letter describing the activities of the 116th M.I. Group and by former intelligence agents who warned that many units would hide copies of blacklists and personality files, regardless of what their civilian superiors told them to do.

In an effort to prevent this, the ACLU asked the District Court on March 12 for a preliminary injunction ordering the Army to cease its destruction of the records and to deliver them (along with inventories, receipts, and certificates of destruction) to the court for safekeeping, pending the outcome of the suit. Then, if the plaintiffs were successful, the court would be in a position to assure complete destruction of the records.

A hearing on this request, and an opposing motion by the Army which asked that the entire suit be thrown out for failure to show that the program violated anyone's constitutional rights, was convened in Washington on April 22 before U.S. District Court Judge George L. Hart, Jr.

Judge Hart, a graduate of Virginia Military Institute and a battlefield colonel during World War II, was openly hostile to the ACLU's contentions. He began the proceedings with an announcement that he would not hear testimony.

In effect, this announcement meant that Hart had prejudged the ACLU's claims. Few, if any, judges would consider issuing an injunction against the government on the basis of affidavits (written statements by persons not present to testify). To do so, of course, would deny the government the opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses against it and would be regarded quite properly as an abuse of judicial discretion.

Hart's reasons became clearer as the hearing progressed. For example, when Frank Askin, the ACLU's chief counsel at the hearing, argued that it would be all right for members of Army intelligence to follow accounts of protest politics in the newspapers, but that they should not be permitted to maintain computerized files on the political activities of specific individuals, the judge scoffed: "It's all right if they remember it, but they can't take note of it. . . . Isn't that ridiculous?"

Nor could he understand why citizens should fear the military's surveillance any more than they should fear reporting of political activities by the news services. "Newspapers don't have guns and don't have jails," Askin responded. ". . . nobody is afraid that one of these days the newsmen are going to sweep into town and come to arrest the troublemakers."

But the judge was unimpressed: "There is no threat that the Army is going to come in and arrest you. . . ." "If it does," he added: "We still sit here with the writ of habeas corpus."

"But, your Honor, then why are they keeping these lists of people, that's the issue at stake. . . . They have no need for this. . . ."

"It may help them know what persons are likely to cause trouble [in civil disturbances] and thereby keep an eye on them," Hart replied, apparently forgetting that the Army had agreed to withdraw the lists precisely because they were not needed for that, or any other, purpose.

The ACLU's other contentions—that the surveillance had exceeded the Army's civil disturbance responsibilities, that riot control troops do not need blacklists to enforce curfews or clear streets, that the CONUS intelligence operations encroached upon the authority of civilian law enforcement agencies—were also rejected. Even Askin's offer to present a former intelligence agent who had infiltrated a coalition of church groups was brushed aside with the question: "Did they have a sign saying 'No Military Personnel Admitted'?"

"What . . . the plaintiffs are complaining of here," Hart decided, "is that the Army is keeping the type of information that is available to the news media in this country and which is in the morgues of the newspapers . . . and magazines . . . They show no unconstitutional action on the part of the Army; they show no threat to their rights." Accordingly, he refused to confiscate the records. Instead, he dismissed the suit.¹

The likelihood that the CONUS intelligence program will be cut back soon is low. The ACLU has asked the Court of Appeals for a prompt hearing and reversal, but that court has yet to act. With summer here, chances of a hearing before fall are dim.

Chances are better that Judge Hart's decision will be overturned on appeal, but even that depends on which members of the relatively liberal Court of Appeals are assigned to review it. The panel could turn out to be as unsympathetic as Judge Hart, in which case the plaintiffs would have to take their appeal to the Supreme Court and suffer still more delays.

Thus, it will be many months at best before the witnesses testify, and perhaps years before a final judgment is rendered. Meanwhile, as the delays multiply and Army security restrictions tighten, the ACLU will find it increasingly difficult to keep its evidence up-to-date.

¹ At a press conference following the hearing, the ACLU's attorneys introduced several witnesses whose testimony Judge Hart refused to hear. One was Oliver Peirce, 25, a former agent assigned to the 5th Military Intelligence Detachment at Fort Carson, Colorado, during the summer and fall of 1969.

One of Peirce's assignments was to infiltrate a group called the Young Adults Project (YAP), which was established by a coalition of local church groups, the Young Democrats, and a ski club to operate a recreation center for emotionally disturbed young people. Although the project was entirely non-political, Peirce said, he and a soldier-informant were directed to make detailed reports on its meetings because one of the group's founders had attended anti-war demonstrations outside the fort and had once been a member of SDS.

In addition to watching YAP, the 5th MID also sent an informant to the 1968 SDS National Convention in Boulder, Colorado, assigned five undercover agents to monitor an anti-war vigil in the chapel of Colorado State College, maintained two full-time infiltrators within the local peace movement, and sent others to observe meetings of the Colorado Springs poverty board.

Operations such as these, Peirce said, were carried out even though they often duplicated political surveillances conducted by the FBI, state and local police, and the Colorado Springs office of the 113th Military Intelligence Group (part of the Army Intelligence Command).

Odds for Congressional hearings are also poor. Representative Gallagher appears to have left the field, while Senator Ervin and his subcommittee staff are swamped by work on other matters. And although many members of Congress have expressed their personal concern about the surveillance, no other Congressional committees have taken up the fight.

Inside the executive branch, prospects are even worse. The Army's civilian leaders have said nothing since Beal's letters of March 20, while Pentagon press officers continue to evade inquiries with the excuse that to answer them would prejudice the ACLU lawsuit.² Moreover, the Justice Department has reasons of its own to put up a stiff legal battle to keep the Army contributing to the expanded surveillance of dissenters ordered by President Nixon. Were the court to end all military domestic intelligence operations, the FBI would have to run the civil disturbance early warning system—a politically risky and tedious task which it does not want—and the FBI and the Secret Service would have to find new alternatives to what has been a free source of supplementary manpower.³ In addition, the Justice Department would be deprived of the Army's political wire service, upon which it depends to feed its political computer and to produce, each week, a four-volume guide to coming events on the political circuit.

No matter how discouraging the prospects for reform may seem, however, efforts to curb the CONUS intelligence program must go on. The initiative remains with Congress—particularly with those committees of Congress which have jurisdiction to hold hearings.⁴

Without the threat of hearings, the Army's civilian leaders are not likely to end their evasions and deceptions, admit the full scope of the program, or reconsider its needs or consequences. They are the crisis managers of their bureaucracy. Threats, not suggestions, determine their agenda.

But while hearings may command their attention, only skillful questioning can move them towards reform. Once the full scope of the program is established, the Army's officials must be pressed to concede what in effect they acknowledged by their promises—that blacklists and dossiers do not contribute to the prediction or control of riots. Having conceded that, they will be hard put to justify the continued pursuit of personality and organizational data in light of its cost, its effect on the willingness of people to

² The rules against official comment on pending lawsuits, of course, were designed to protect criminal defendants from prejudicial pre-trial publicity. They do not exist to immunize the government from press inquiries when its officials are accused in civil court of exceeding their authority.

³ During the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, for example, Army agents posed as TV camera crews, a naval intelligence agent tape-recorded speeches in Grant Park, and two plainclothesmen from the staff of the Army Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence occupied assigned seats within the convention hall. All of this assistance—and more—was given despite the Counterintelligence Analysis Division's correct prediction that federal troops would not be needed.

⁴ Besides Senator Ervin's Constitutional Rights Subcommittee (of the Judiciary Committee), these include Senator Edward M. Kennedy's Subcommittee on Administrative Practices and Procedures (also of the Judiciary Committee), Senator John Stennis' Armed Services Committee, Senator Abraham Ribicoff's Committee on Executive Reorganization (of the Committee on Government Operations), and Congressman Robert W. Kastenmeier's Subcommittee No. 3 (of the House Judiciary Committee).

participate in politics, and the mischief that could result were the records to fall into the hands of blackmailers, demagogues, or security clearance adjudicators.

To question the Army's needs, however, is not enough. The hearings should also define the Army's authority to monitor civilian politics in light of such principles as civilian control of the military, state and civilian primacy in law enforcement, compartmentalization and decentralization of intelligence duties, and obedience to the constitutional scheme of separate branches of government sharing policy-making powers.

Finally, whether or not the hearings produce legislation, they should attempt to establish a consensus on what the lines between permissible and impermissible conduct for Army intelligence should be.

This will be the hardest task of all. There is no question that the Army must know about incidents and activities which bear upon the need for federal riot troops and the manner in which they may best be deployed. Similarly, there is no question that it does not need to know anything about the beliefs and actions of individuals and groups that pose no threat to military security or public order. Nor is there any reason to believe that Army agents must conduct undercover operations in order to calculate the size, location, and kind of riot troops may be called upon to quell.

The difficulty will come in determining (1) the extent to which military intelligence units in the field should be permitted to watch controversial political figures on the theory that "agitators" cause riots, and (2) the extent to which the Army, through CIAD or similar units, should be expected to analyze the political and social aspects of civil disturbances. There are strong reasons for leaving both of these functions up to civilian authorities. On the other hand, the domestic intelligence section of CIAD has a fairly good record for common sense and has more than once persuaded hard-nosed generals that demonstrators and rioters are not "the enemy," "insurgents," or part of "the Communist conspiracy."

Wherever the lines around the Army spy program are finally drawn, however, action on them should begin promptly. Incredible though it may seem, the Army has already assembled the apparatus of a police state. That apparatus must be disassembled before it falls into the hands of those who would deliberately or inadvertently misuse it.

THE CONUS INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM TODAY

From what various Army spokesmen have said publicly and privately, and from the observations of sources who cannot be identified, it is possible to assemble a description of the CONUS intelligence program today.

(1) The blanket surveillance of civilian political activity by the Army, cut back in January, has resumed.

(2) This surveillance is a part-time activity for more than 1,000 agents of the Army Intelligence Command, who work out of some 300 offices from coast to coast, and for hundreds of agents and informants associated with troop units and installations of the Continental Army Command.

(3) Sources of CONUS intelligence continue to include local and state police, the FBI, newspapers, and Army undercover operations. While most direct surveillances of lawful politics were to have ceased in January, Army plainclothesmen have been spotted recently on the Milwaukee and Madison campuses of the University of Wisconsin and at the University of Oklahoma.

(4) Non-computerized regional data banks on dissenters remain at most field, region, and headquarters offices of the Army Intelligence Command and within the G-2 (intelligence) offices of many troop units

and installations of the Continental Army Command.

(5) One computerized data bank may continue to exist at Continental Army Command headquarters, Fort Monroe, Virginia.

(6) The Army has said that it intends to keep domestic political information in its microfilm archive at the Counterintelligence Analysis Division. It has given no assurances that these records will be purged of information about persons or groups posing no threat to the armed forces or to public order.

(7) Both the Intelligence Command's "Identification list" and CIAD's "Compendium" have been ordered destroyed. Chances are excellent, however, that copies of both remain in circulation, along with another blacklist published by the Alabama state police and distributed by the Intelligence Command to the headquarters and region offices of each M.I. Group.

(8) It is also likely that copies of the magnetic tapes which made up the memory core of the Fort Holabird computer have been hidden away or transferred to other governmental agencies.

(9) The Army's intelligence reports continue to go to the FBI and to the Justice Department's interdivisional intelligence unit, where they are stored in a computer larger than the one abandoned at Fort Holabird.

(10) The Army's domestic intelligence operations appear to have been cut back because the locus of civil disturbance decision-making has shifted from the Pentagon to the Justice Department. In fact, however, the Army's operations have not decreased; only the spotlight has shifted.

(11) Meanwhile, new security measures make public scrutiny of the Intelligence Command more difficult. Aspects of its domestic intelligence effort have been classified (although they can hardly be of interest to foreign spies), the job of collecting political information has been re-assigned to career agents wherever possible, and all agents have been threatened with prosecution if they talk.

DESPITE DENIALS, ARMY SENDS SPIES TO RALLIES

(By Morton Kondracke)

Despite Army denials that it engages in such activity, a military intelligence unit in Washington regularly infiltrates and reports on civilian political groups.

And in spite of assurances the Army gave to a congressman, the unit has not destroyed its extensive political file on civilians. It has merely classified it to keep it secret.

Agents of the unit, the 116th Military Intelligence Group, have posed as newsmen and photographers at rallies to get pictures for their files and at one time the unit even maintained a video tape truck market "Midwest News."

NO LONGER HAS TRUCK

The truck and its taping equipment, purchased at the end of a fiscal year with unexpended funds, have been disposed of recently out of concern the civilian spying activity would be discovered and exposed.

Information on the unit's activities was given to the Sun-Times by sources who asked not to be identified. Col. Frederick Barrett, commander of the 116th, refused to grant a request for an interview saying Army regulations prohibited it.

Data on the 116th's activities has been supplied to Rep. Cornelius Gallagher, D-N.J., who, with Sen. Sam Ervin, D-N.C., has been probing Army civilian intelligence gathering.

Both Gallagher and Ervin earlier this year announced plans to hold hearings on intelligence gathering and evaluation programs maintained by the armed services and aimed at civilians in this country. Gallagher, how-

ever, called off the proposed House hearings earlier this month.

UNIT NOT MENTIONED

In his announcement of that cancellation, Gallagher made no mention of the activities of the 116th. The Army has not replied to a series of questions about the 116th submitted 10 days ago.

The activities of the 116th appear to contradict official assurances given by the Army on Jan. 26 that it never engages in undercover operations in the civilian community.

In answer to a question about general intelligence activities, the Army said that "for some time, there has been a specific prohibition against military personnel undertaking such activities as undercover operations in the civilian community."

"Exceptions to this policy may be made by appropriate civilian officials, but none have been made."

Despite this statement, the 116th maintains a staff of 20 agents whose jobs it is to infiltrate political groups and to observe politically active persons in the Washington area.

POSE AS STUDENTS

Some of the agents have grown beards and long hair to pass as students on college campuses in the Washington area. Others pose as members of the working press to obtain pictures of those involved in political activities.

The pictures are kept on file and are reproduced for agents attending demonstrations to enable them to identify those participating.

The unit has furnished tape recorders to agents attending rallies so they can clandestinely record speeches and conversations.

The videotape-sound truck was driven to demonstrations by agents posing as television newsmen for the nonexistent "Midwest News."

At one large demonstration, the Nov. 15 anti-war march on Washington, intelligence agents were assigned to bridges along the Baltimore-Washington parkway to count the number of buses heading for Washington bearing demonstrators.

OTHER UNITS USED

The political intelligence activities of the 116th are frequently undertaken in concert with two other groups, the 108th at Ft. Meade, Md., and the 902D, also located in Washington, which reports directly to the assistant chief of staff for intelligence.

Information collected by the 116th is transferred to a file of 5-by-7-inch index cards. The unit has several thousand such cards on file, each referring to a different activist in the Washington area.

The cards contain a picture of the person, his name, address, occupation and background, a list of the political groups to which he belongs, notes on political meetings and demonstrations he has attended, and a summary of his views on political issues.

One person known to be listed in the file is Julius Hobson, civil rights activist and former member of the Washington Board of Education.

Existence of such a file appears to contradict assurances the Army gave Gallagher that political intelligence records at local military intelligence groups would be destroyed.

ONE FILE DESTROYED

The Sun-Times received information from the Army, however, that the only file so far destroyed was the computerized data bank maintained at the Army intelligence center at Ft. Holabird in Baltimore.

Information that formerly fed the computer is still at Holabird on paper, and no order has been issued to destroy it or files kept at the local level.

Similar files are located at military intelligence units at Ft. Devens, Mass.; Ft. Meade; Ft. McPherson, Ga.; Ft. Sheridan, Ill.; Ft. Sam Houston, Tex.; San Francisco and Honolulu. Other files are located at Ft. Monroe, Va., and a microfilm file, containing FBI reports as well as Army information, is kept by the Army's counterintelligence analysis division in Alexandria, Va.

Shortly after Army general counsel Robert E. Jordan III gave Gallagher assurances about the destruction of these files, a meeting was held at the 116th to inform agents that the unit would continue most of its activities.

FILES CLASSIFIED

The only activity to be discontinued, the agents were told was operation of the computer in Baltimore. The agents were told they would continue to infiltrate and monitor local political groups.

However, the agents were informed that all files and operations of the 116th were to be classified to prevent release of any information about them to either the press or Congress.

The agents were warned that disclosure of the information would subject them to court-martial or prosecution in civilian courts "for violation of national security."

EMPHASIS REQUIRED ON PRODUCTIVITY

Mr. MILLER, Mr. President, President Nixon's recent statement on economic policy placed a much-needed perspective on some of our problems and added impetus to the Nixon administration's anti-inflationary policies.

In a condition in which the economy is moving from a wartime to a peacetime economy, it is more important than ever that the public realize the full impact of all that is taking place, especially the responsibility Congress has in implementing anti-inflationary policies.

An important contribution to the dialog in the inflation area was made by Charles Brophy, editor-in-chief of "The Bond Buyer," in the editions of June 1. While the article was written prior to the President's economic policy statement, it provides an insight into the reasons why emphasis is required on productivity. I ask unanimous consent that the article be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SNAP SHOT IS PRODUCTIVITY; MAKE IT A SURE SHOT AND THE NIXON REGIME COULD BAG LEGAL LIMIT FOR DECADE

(By Charles Brophy)

Gaylord Freeman, who is chairman of the First National Bank of Chicago and who is one of the nation's finest banking leaders, said last month in Chicago that the U.S. Government will have either to institute wage and price controls, increase taxes, or reduce its own expenditures. He went on to say that "limitation of the money supply is the only alternative if you want to stop inflation and aren't willing to have wage and price controls or higher taxes or lower Government spending and limiting the money supply invariably means higher interest rates."

This general approach currently is the popular expression among our most astute business and financial leaders whose sound thinking and interest in the national welfare compels them to put forth possible remedies which may be, given their appreciation for the efficiency of a free economic society,

either personally viewed as undesirable or even abhorrent.

Within the Federal Reserve System, even Alfred Hayes, who is not only president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York but also vice chairman of the Federal Open Market Committee, has come around to the point of view this year that "wage and price guidelines" may serve some useful purpose even though they are a less desirable solution. For Mr. Hayes, this is quite a contrast to his earlier opposition to guidelines as being essentially worthless because they are unworkable.

A great many people are opposed, of course, to wage and price controls or wage and price guidelines, including President Nixon, on the basis that they are against them on principle, view them as unworkable, of themselves, or think they are politically unpalatable.

I think there is another way out of this dilemma which would sidestep the need for higher taxes, or the need for lower government expenditures, or the need for wage and price guidelines and wage and price controls, or the need for a persistently tight Federal Reserve credit policy.

In fact, this way out could produce higher gross Federal tax revenues with lower tax rates, could allow for higher government expenditures, could permit an expansive credit policy with substantially lower interest rates, and could erase the need for wage and price guidelines.

There is no sense in belaboring each of the points involved in this analysis, nor is there any point in reproducing the equations of the calculus which are essential, in their derivatives, to what is essentially a motion study in the classic "minimax" analysis.

The points, without belaboring them, should be made, however, and they are placed in several "sets."

The points are these in the first set:

1. Inflation is the most serious problem the nation faces and without its solution all else will be lost. The inflationary road we are on will lead us not to a "money panic" of the 1837 or 1907 variety because neither Washington nor the Federal Reserve believe that this is a possible "cure," given the social climate and the nation's illiquidity which could turn a money panic into something much worse. Instead, the inflationary road we are on, if it continues long enough, has a better chance of ending in the classic money inflation of Germany after World War I.

2. Despite the seriousness of the inflationary problem, the nation's populace is not really alarmed about inflation nor could it easily be aroused even with greater efforts to this purpose than have already been made. This is so in part because many people regard inflation as the inevitable dictum of an impersonal, impregnable economic machine; in part because so many people are insulated against inflation either through strong representations in wage negotiations by labor unions, or through cost of living clauses in retirement plans, or because they are at the stage in life where they are net sellers of assets (such as parcelling off accumulated land) rather than net buyers of assets, so that inflation is read by them as a positive benefit. In fact, one of the most critical problems of the present inflationary dilemma is that inflation, at this juncture in its course, is regarded more as a benefit rather than the other way around. Most people actually like moderate doses of inflation; what they own goes up in price, and this is good for the ego as well as the wallet.

The second set of points revolves around the insufficiencies in the standard list of remedies. Again, without belaboring them:

1. Both fiscal policy and Federal Reserve credit policy have fallen short of the goal of breaking inflationary expectations and bringing the rate of inflation down to a ra-

tional rate. More often than not, fiscal policy and credit policy have been out of step, with the one undoing the other, looked at from both aspects, since 1966. We are now at the point where we must look at both the fiscal and credit policy equations from a hard-headed practical view and recognize two things: Fiscal policy, from a practical point of view can make no more contribution to restraint than it already has, which has not been much. Credit policy has gone as far as it can go; it would be dangerous from a social political, financial and economic viewpoint to attempt to tighten credit any further now than it is, which is less than it was late last year by a substantial margin. On this score, credit policy has failed to contain inflation and is now in a position where it is obligatory to build the money supply at a faster rate than is desirable, given the continuing high rate of inflation we now have. At best, we will end up with a recession in business activity, accompanied by high costs and continuing inflation. An impossible combination? Think about it; it's what's happening, kiddo. At worst? Think about that, too.

2. Higher taxes, or even a continuance of the income tax surcharge beyond the end of June, are no solution for a variety of reasons. First there is the reality of the political problem. Second, they are high already, and, taken together with sharply rising State and local sales, property and income taxes are imposing a financial burden on the populace which is having the undesirable effect of a backlash against desirable social projects. Third, higher taxes are not all that deflationary because the U.S. Government spends the money. It does no good to say that the Government would spend the money anyway; the corollary to Parkinson's law is that Governments can never have more than monetary surpluses because Government spending rises to meet the new, higher level of receipts. Looked at this way higher taxes belong in the "transfer" category.

3. Lower Government expenditures, including Federal and State and local government spending, are politically difficult as cuts always hurt somebody, and beyond that, reductions in expenditures are in certain sectors socially undesirable.

4. Wage and price controls are politically impossible, are inefficient, and are really unworkable. Admitted, that World War II contained as much relative price stability as was possible, but no account is taken of the quality deterioration which was severe. As for wage and price guidelines, they are politically possible, but are really unworkable as they are generally challenged or ignored. They are undemocratic as they are not met with equal responsiveness from all sectors of the economy, thus serving to undermine national character. They raise ticklish legal questions. Regarding guidelines, what is the responsibility of a steel company president to abide by them, given his allegiance to stockholders, if the steel labor union ignores them?

The way out, it seems to me, is productivity and not a long-time-period secular increase, but a rapid inspired short-time-period increase of very dramatic nature. The complex relationship involving productivity, costs, prices, savings and eleven other factors is startlingly clear in the equations but it is plodding going in the English language.

Productivity involves rates of change, or ratios, as between physical units (not value) of input and physical units of output. Ordinarily, productivity is associated with capital formation, and that field has been well-tilled over the past two centuries. Historically, it runs from Adam Smith through the Marshallian analysis, in his quaint arithmetic and diagrammatic footnotes, through the Austrian school with its lengthening pyramid of production and in more recent times through the Swedish school.

As I mentioned above, the derivatives in productivity are associated generally with capital formation. Give a man a capital good in the form of a stapler, and he can staple four times as many sheets of paper together as he could previously put together with paper clips. Try it.

But, I am not talking about productivity from the side of capital formation. I am talking about it from the side of labor's contribution. I know of one industry where productivity, literally, could double if the contract restrictions were removed. Or, take the building trades industry, where urban and single-unit construction required in the next ten years, taking into account the "catch-up" from the low levels of the past several years, points to the biggest challenge in construction history.

I have seen estimates which suggest that the revamping of building codes and the removal of contract restrictions in the building industry could increase productivity by 30 per cent.

But, those are isolated examples. Let's take the points one-by-one.

1. The first thing which is required is to find out if a quantum jump in productivity is possible, and by that I mean a large, short-term jump to cover the 1970s, where the charting would be on a whole new scale. I happen to know that such a quantum jump is possible, but that isn't enough in this case. So, regrettably, what is needed is a Presidential Commission on the Nation's Productivity to report within three months. Productivity is coldly calculable so it won't take any longer.

2. The second thing which is required, after discovering the veins of gold to be mined from productivity on the labor side, is whether the mining is feasible, whether the whole idea is workable.

Let's look at the points involved in that.

1. As politics is the art of making the proper palatable, let's look at this first. Let's assume that, realistically, we will need to live with inflation around 3 per cent and let's assume, some may say not so realistically, that we can get productivity up to 4 per cent (it's now a slight negative factor). What does that mean in the form of President Nixon's domestic economic program for the 1970s, which oversteps in its vision the November elections. It means that the workman can double his money income in ten years, which is not so far off, and it means he can increase his real income by better than half.

Push productivity to 7 per cent (improbable but not impossible), it's 15 per cent in Japan and he can double his real income in 10 years and double his money income in seven years.

2. The principal labor objection in this is the valid fear underlying contract restrictions. But, given the desired social programs and economic programs in this country, and given our responsibilities to underpinning the growth of the under-developed nations, and this country is going to be chronically "labor short" in this decade.

3. Another labor objection is that transitional unemployment will arise. For this, there is the government guarantee of financing the transitional cases. There really won't be any transitional cases, as a practical matter.

4. As between costs and prices, there is presently a profit squeeze, and as profits are the real driving force in any enterprise economy, they cannot be ignored. To put prices up, thereby creating profits, is inflationary which is undesirable. There is, practically, no point in thinking wage rates are coming down in order to create a profit spread between costs and prices.

But, and the distinction is critical, through sharp increases in productivity there can be further wage increases and larger profits through the resultant sharp decline in labor unit costs. Growing wages,

growing profits and lower labor unit costs. It's not an unmixable equation.

As Lawrence Septimus Arnold, seventh son of the British brokerage firm of W. A. Arnold & Son, used to say every week at Ye Olde Chop House, the eternal verity is that people want more money.

Productivity is the way to give it to them, and start curbing inflation to boot.

THE SALT TALKS AND THE CBW PROTOCOL

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, yesterday I discussed the major arguments in favor of ratification of the Geneva Protocol of 1925 prohibiting chemical and biological warfare. Today I would like to analyze the major argument against ratification in light of the strategic arms limitation talks now being held in Helsinki. In one crucial sense, nuclear weapons and chemical and biological warfare agents are similar. Both types of weapons are so horrible that each side feels it must maintain a large arsenal in order to establish an effective deterrent against their use by the other. Reduced to its simplest form, this argument runs that if Russia has CBW, the United States must, too, and vice versa. This is exactly the argument which has provided the fuel for the nuclear arms race. It has been the basic argument which has been used to justify the construction of MIRV and the ABM. It is predicated on the fundamental belief that you can never trust the enemy. While denouncing such weapons as too horrible to use, both sides have continued to work feverishly toward perfecting even more terrible forms, all in the name of national defense. Like the nuclear arms race, the CBW race is a vicious cycle supported by fear and mistrust which can only be broken by one side admitting it might be able to trust the other.

This is where the SALT talks become particularly important. For the first time, both the United States and Russia have been willing to sit down and meaningfully negotiate over nuclear arms limitation. In view of the progress which has already been made, should not the United States seek a similar accord on the use of chemical and biological weapons? Certainly the time is ripe for such an initiative. Without question, the most important step we could now take to show our willingness to work with the Soviets on these weapons is to ratify the Geneva Protocol first drafted in 1925. I strongly urge President Nixon to resubmit this protocol to the Senate in order that it can be given speedy consideration.

THE LAW SCHOOL GRADUATE AND HIS PRIORITIES

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, at this time thousands of 1970 law school graduates across the country are studying for bar examinations.

My good friend Justice Arno H. Denecke, of the Oregon Supreme Court, wrote an excellent article for the Willamette Lawyer aimed at those young men and women studying for the Oregon bar exam. I think his comments, however, have meaning for all new lawyers.

I ask unanimous consent that Justice Denecke's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GRADUATE AND HIS PRIORITIES
(By Justice Arno Denecke, Oregon Supreme Court)

From now to September are eventful months for the seniors,—J.D.s and licenses to practice law. The end of a long routine. The beginning of freedom. The end of no money. The beginning of some relative affluence. A time to indulge oneself.

Sometime, months or maybe years after the exhilaration of these next months, you become aware that there will not be any more graduations or bar admissions causing a complete change in your life style. You will then be doing basically what you will be doing the rest of your life. This is the date at which you consciously or sub-consciously will commence to establish priorities. What comes first? What comes second? I hope the practice of law and your wife and children occupy high priorities. You have additional priorities that you should consider.

You are a member of a profession; in my opinion the most influential profession of all. Our profession practices self-discipline and self-help to maintain our high professional status and to exert our profession's influence upon the rest of society. In order for this to continue you must give a high priority to activities needed in your profession. Thousands of lawyers are doing this today but the need grows greater.

Most of these activities are channeled through local, state and the American Bar Association. Some laymen and a few lawyers contemptuously think of the bar associations as "closed shop unions," and believe that the association's principal purpose is to restrict the number of lawyers so as to insure that the present members of the bar will have a sufficient number of clients and an adequate income. This is a completely erroneous impression.

In Oregon and in other states, the State Bar, as agents of the Supreme Court, handles the mechanics of admissions to the bar and disciplinary cases and makes recommendations to the Supreme Court. The only criterion is, what is in the public interest? The efficient performance of these two functions is perhaps the most time-consuming public service demanded of members of the bar yet this must be done well and has been done well. Your assistance in this capacity is one of the highest services you could perform for your profession and the public.

A segment of the lay community and some lawyers regard bar associations, particularly the American Bar Association, as the domain of the reactionaries. This again, is a misconception.

Like all other institutions, bar associations have members who are more conservative on more issues than the majority of lawyers or a majority of the public. When the views of these more conservative members coincide with the views of the majority of the moderates, this becomes the position of the bar association. However, conservative views do not always coincide with the views of the majority in bar associations.

A good contemporary picture of the outlook of the American Bar Association is contained in an address by the President of the Association to the Mississippi State Bar, reprinted in 40 Miss L J 461 (Oct. 1969), on the Administration of Justice. That section of the address dealing with the work in Mississippi of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law is particularly revealing.

Outstanding Oregon lawyers, including partners in the largest firms in the state,

have gone to Mississippi for the Civil Rights Committee for four to six weeks and have provided first-rate representation by local lawyers. This, of course, was provided for no compensation. Hopefully, this need will not exist for much longer.

However, there will be other needs in other places. Continuing legal education is a growing need for the profession. In some states the law schools take care of most of this need; however, in Oregon and elsewhere the practicing bench and bar, guided by a bar committee, do this for the profession. Certainly, the participants benefit from what they learn in preparation for such services, and the prestige of being selected to participate is personally gratifying as well as possibly business producing. However, the time is spent largely because of the knowledge that it is necessary for the good of the profession.

All of these gratuitous bar activities by lawyers may produce some indirect economic benefits; however, this is not the motivating factor for most participants. Lawyers perform these public services because of their sense of professional responsibility to the community.

In addition to participating in bar activities, many lawyers believe that they have an obligation, as lawyers, to lend their talents to other activities—governmental, educational, charitable, religious, etc.

Although we have recognized the lofty motives of such lawyers, we should be objective and also remember that lawyers as a class like to believe that they are essential to all important decisions. In this area you must periodically reassess your priorities. If you show a willingness to participate in some of these areas, as I believe you should, your services, without compensation, will be eagerly sought. It is easy to lose track of other responsibilities of high priority when deeply involved with matters of great public importance. Unless you exhibit some restraint you may soon be neglecting your practice and your family. There are only so many hours in a day.

We assume you will be good lawyers, take competent care of your clients, and provide reasonably well for yourself and family. We sincerely hope that you will also take the time and effort to honor your obligation to your profession and to your community.

CLARK MOLLENHOFF

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am indeed sorry that Clark Mollenhoff will soon be leaving his position as a counselor to the President. I am aware of the many contributions Mr. Mollenhoff has made during this past year in his service at the White House, and I can only regret that the President will no longer have the benefit of his outstanding service.

However, all of us know the great record Mr. Mollenhoff has compiled as a member of the press corps for the past two decades. Now that he is returning once again to that profession, we shall all await the contributions we know he will make. I wish him only continued success in all his endeavors.

Mr. Mollenhoff's departure may be a loss to the President and the entire Nixon administration but his return to journalism is definitely a plus for the American newspaper readership as well as the effort in which so many of us have had an interest to provide greater balance and fairness in news coverage.

STATEMENT OF CUBAN EXILE COMMUNITY

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, exiles and refugees from Castro's Cuba, since 1962, have been constantly harassed in their efforts to help liberate their own country. On June 6, 1970, Costa Rica's Foreign Minister Gonzalo Facio called for action by the nations of this hemisphere to rid Cuba of its Soviet overlord and to put an end to Castro's outflow of aggression and subversion against their governments.

I should like to point out in this connection that Mr. Facio speaks for no reactionary government, but for the liberal administration of that noted Latin American statesman, now President of Costa Rica, Don Jose Figueres. In his speech, Foreign Minister Facio said:

The only effective solution I see to put a stop to Castroite aggression against his people and the rest of Latin America is to promote an internal uprising.

Mr. Facio then asked this question:

Is this possible?

And answered:

Judging from the internal situation in Cuba, my answer is a qualified yes.

He called for a catalyst in the form of effective leadership in exile, a vigorous psychological warfare program, and strong and effective support to groups of rebels inside Cuba who form the base of insurrection.

It appears, however, that our own State Department is still doing its best to prevent Cuban exile leaders from supporting the very measures that Mr. Facio has advocated. Many of those leaders, formerly divided as to tactics, although united in their ultimate goals, have signed a statement published in *Diario las Americas* on June 13, 1970. Among those signing this important document are two former Presidents and two former Vice Presidents of Cuba, Juanita Castro, the former Speaker of Cuba's House of Representatives, and action groups who are prevented from carrying the battle to Fidel Castro.

I ask unanimous consent that this document be printed in translation in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF POSITION—CUBAN EXILE COMMUNITY

Our fundamental conviction is that Cuba, our country, must be liberated from the Communist regime that represses it. It is no less our conviction that we Cubans have the duty to do so—within the limits of respect which we hold for the laws of the United States.

We therefore declare the following:

We cannot accept the position of the Department of State as transmitted to Cuban exile leaders "to apply certain norms or measures to any person or organization that combats the Cuban regime from this country or a third country (if such person or organization is headquartered in the United States)." Some measures have already been initiated against certain Cubans for combatting the Castro regime.

OUR POSITION

Our declarations are not formulated out of mere ego nor made to promote useless confrontations at the expense of harming the historic ties that have always linked the destiny of our two countries.

Our struggle is deeply rooted in Christian ethic and democratic thought and cannot be analyzed, much less judged, by narrow legal interpretations.

Our right to fight for Cuba also involves the security of a continent now threatened by Communist aggression based in Cuba and is made in support of the preservation of the democratic institutions of the entire Western Hemisphere.

Our declarations, our position, is stimulated by the announced decision of the Department of State. They have a two-fold purpose. One is to express to the American public our cause; the other represents a respectful appeal to the President of the United States to rectify the errors made by officials of his departments and agencies. In our judgment, actions taken by such officials are wrong and violate the spirit of justice which is the foundation of this great nation.

OUR MUTUAL HISTORY

Joint resolution of 1898

The destiny of the Cuban nation was linked to that of the United States through the Joint Resolution of Congress signed by President McKinley on April 20. The resolution recognizes the right of the Cuban people to be free and independent and provided for assistance to the Cuban people to end Spanish domination.

The Bay of Pigs

Sixty-three years later, the American nation, in just alliance with the Cubans, again linked its destiny with Cuba. On April 17, 1961 Cuban and American blood ran at the Bay of Pigs in order to put an end to the totalitarian regime that today continues to oppress the Cubans.

Neutrality laws

On April 20, 1961, only three days following the Bay of Pigs disaster, the then Attorney General of the United States, Robert Kennedy, said of the neutrality laws:

"They are among the oldest laws on our statute books, and not designed for the kind of situation which exists in the world today. They were not designed to prevent individuals from leaving the United States to fight for a cause in which they believed. There is nothing in those laws which prevents refugees from Cuba from returning to that country to engage in fighting for freedom."

Title 18, Section 960 of the U.S. Code (one of the neutrality laws) prohibits certain actions against a nation with which the United States "is at peace"—a "friendly nation" with the United States and, by breaking diplomatic relations on January 3, 1961, the United States recognizes that Cuba is hardly a "friendly nation." We therefore conclude that this part of the "neutrality laws" cannot be applied against Cubans who are "fighting for freedom."

Joint resolution of 1962—P.L. 87-733

"The purpose of the resolution is to provide a means of expressing national unity regarding U.S. policies toward Cuba. To this end, the resolution declares the determination of the United States—

"(a) to prevent by whatever means may be necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere;

"(to prevent in Cuba the creation or use

of an externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States; and

"(c) to work with the Organization of American States and with freedom-loving Cubans to support the aspirations of the Cuban people for self-determination."

This resolution, signed by President John F. Kennedy on October 3, 1961 is known as Public Law 87-733. As such, it has the force of law and represents the latest and strongest national position on Cuba.

We consider it to be against this law when members of the Executive branch of government applies measures and dispositions intended to prevent the Cubans from regaining their country.

We would also point out that a number of international agreements have been signed by the United States which uphold the right of "freedom-loving Cubans" to fight for their country. One of these came out of the VIII Meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the OAS in July, 1964.

In its Declaration to the Cuban People the Council expressed: "Its deepest hope that the Cuban people, strengthened by confidence in the solidarity with them of the other American peoples and governments, will be able, by their own endeavor, very soon to liberate themselves from the tyranny of the communist regime that oppresses them and to establish in that country a government freely elected by the will of the people that will assure respect for fundamental human rights."

It is the solidarity and spirit of the Joint Resolution of 1962 and the Declaration to the Cuban People that guide us in our efforts against the Communist regime in Cuba.

THE NIXON DOCTRINE

Though we fight to put an end to Communist slavery in our country and to a regime that threatens freedom in the Americas, we have not solicited the armed support of other nations nor endangered their security. Our principles are, in fact, strengthened by the Nixon Doctrine which recognizes "the right to assistance and help by any people who through their own efforts and dedication, fight against the oppressive forces of international Communism."

VIETNAM, CAMBODIA, CUBA

The spirit of universal justice contained in previous declarations, and the Nixon Doctrine, is apparent in interpretations surrounding the war in Southeast Asia. It is not evident in the prevention of Cubans from liberating their country only 90 miles away.

Cuban boys are fighting and dying in Vietnam and Cambodia for the same ideals that Cubans declare their right to fight for their own country. It is inexplicable to us that similar cases provoke entirely different interpretations and response from the same government.

CONGRESS HAS SPOKEN, STILL SPEAKS

It is clear from the record of Congressional action taken in the United States that the will of the people has been measured. It is no less clear that an increasing number of Congressmen today recognize the danger and support our cause.

Our cause is mutual. The United States and Cuba are two peoples formed from the same crucible of revolution against outside force. One of us has lost our country; but we have not lost our cause.

For these reasons we not only direct our appeal to the people of the United States but to the President, confident that the actions taken by members of the Government will be corrected. We recall with pride and emotion the words spoken by President Nixon on October 12, 1968:

"There is also on record a commitment which a new administration will reaffirm to the Cuban people. We do not accept as permanent the existence of Cuba as a Caribbean colony of the Soviet empire."

THE TRIUMPH OF FREE ENTERPRISE—ADDRESS BY ARTHUR F. BURNS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, last Thursday, July 2, in Tokyo, Arthur F. Burns, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, delivered a most interesting and significant address entitled "The Triumph of Free Enterprise." It contained high praise for Japan's economic achievements in the last decade. It contained a forceful defense of the economic efficiency and political virtues of a free enterprise economic system.

In addition, it contained some useful thinking about the future of Asian development and about the role of free economies in that development.

So that all Senators may profit from the wisdom of Chairman Burns, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE TRIUMPH OF FREE ENTERPRISE

(Address by Arthur F. Burns)

It is a great pleasure for me to visit Japan again. Four years have passed since I was here last, and while I have heard much of the progress and prosperity you have experienced, it is good to see the evidence with one's own eyes. My personal knowledge of Japan goes back some ten years. During my last visit, in early 1966, the mood was not one of universal optimism because you were then experiencing a readjustment in the rate of production and profits. There are always those who find any economic pause a justification for pessimism about the future. I have not been one of those. I have long been impressed by the great resiliency of the Japanese economy. I believe that you have discovered a formula for economic progress that will continue to bring excellent results in the future as it has in the past. That is not to say that you will not encounter problems. You will. But your resiliency lies in the skill you have developed in devising solutions to problems and your ability to work together as a nation to achieve your goals.

This is a particularly interesting time for an economist to visit Japan. As I am sure all of you recall, fiscal year 1970 was designated as a target year in the economic plan unveiled by Prime Minister Ikeda in 1961. In what many people then thought was a fantastically ambitious design for the future, he calmly announced that Japan planned to double her gross national product between the years 1960 and 1970.

It is therefore fitting, as we are gathered here today, to take note of how the actual achievement of Japan compared with Mr. Ikeda's bold projection of a decade ago. While his plan called for a national output that in this fiscal year would be twice that of 1960, it now appears that your national product will in fact be at least 180 per cent above 1960.

The Ikeda plan projected exports reaching \$9.3 billion this year, while imports would rise to \$9.9 billion. It is now believed that exports will come to nearly \$20 billion and imports to nearly \$19 billion.

The Ikeda plan foresaw Japanese steel production rising to 45 million tons this year. It will actually be around 80 million tons.

According to the Ikeda plan, a big expansion was to occur in automobile production. But while it was then thought that the output of passenger car, trucks, and buses would amount to about 2.2 million units, it now appears that well over 4 million vehicles will be produced this year.

I might go on with such comparisons, but it is not necessary to do so. Virtually all indicators tell the same story. Far from being overly optimistic, as many people then thought, Mr. Ikeda and his colleagues—who drew up the ten-year plan at Prime Minister Ikeda's request—were very conservative in their projections. However, I am sure that no one will find fault with them for that. They would not have been believed had they forecast the achievements that have actually come to pass.

It is interesting to recall that a few years before Japan unveiled its income-doubling plan, the Soviet Union had already singled out the year 1970 as the date by which its economy would surpass the United States in production per capita and in the standard of living. It may be worth recalling Mr. Khrushchev's precise words:

"The superiority of the U.S.S.R. in the speed of growth of production will create a real basis for insuring that within a period of, say, five years following 1965, the level of U.S. production per capita should be equalled and overtaken. Thus by that time, perhaps even sooner, the U.S.S.R. will have captured first place in the world both in absolute volume of production and per capita production, which will insure the world's highest standard of living."

To achieve this goal, the U.S.S.R. would have been obliged to more than double its per capita GNP even if the United States made no further progress and simply maintained its per capita output at the 1960 level. However, unlike Japan, the U.S.S.R. fell far short of the goal that Khrushchev had set for 1970.

The economic contest between the U.S.S.R. and the United States enters the year 1970 with the United States holding a commanding lead. In 1969, total output per person in the United States was nearly \$4,600. This was two-and-a-half times the corresponding Soviet figure. Measured in real terms, the gap between the per capita GNP of the United States and the Soviet Union was more than 25 per cent higher in 1969 than in 1960. While the Soviet growth rate was slightly higher than the American rate, the difference was so slight that if the same growth rates were maintained over the next 50 years, the per capita GNP of the United States would still be about double that of the Soviet Union in the year 2020.

The wide difference between the living standards of the Soviet Union and the United States is vividly portrayed by comparisons of the number of working hours required to earn enough to buy various goods and services. It turns out, for example, that the average worker in Moscow in April 1969 had to work nearly seven times as long as his counterpart in New York to earn enough to buy an identical supply of food sufficient to feed a family of four for one week. The difference for many non-food items was even larger. The following are the multiples by which the cost of certain goods in Moscow exceeded the cost in New York, when cost is measured in terms of working time: for bath soap—12.5 times, for nylon stockings—14 times, for a man's shirt—12 times, for a refrigerator—12 times.

These comparisons are based on official prices in Moscow, not black market prices, which are, in many cases, far higher. For example, a Volga sedan costing the equivalent of \$7,700 reportedly sells for 2.5 times that amount on the Moscow black market.

LESSONS FROM THE EXPERIENCE OF JAPAN, THE U.S.S.R., AND THE UNITED STATES

Although the U.S.S.R. has failed even to come close to the economic performance of the United States, the per capita output of Japan has probably already overtaken that of the U.S.S.R. The official figure for per capita GNP of Japan in 1969 is very similar to our estimate for per capita GNP of the Soviet Union. If the figures are adjusted to

allow for differences in the purchasing power of the currency that are not adequately reflected in the exchange rates, Japan appears to have surpassed the Soviet Union in 1969.

There are important lessons to be learned from Japan's extraordinary economic success and the concomitant shortcoming of the Soviet Union. The rather high rates of growth recorded for the Soviet Union in the early postwar years have not been sustained because of deficiencies inherent in the Soviet system. In a free economy, the relative strength of the demand for goods and services determines the allocation of productive resources. In the Soviet system, on the other hand, the path that production takes is basically shaped by the decisions of economic planners in Moscow.

Important economic decisions in the Soviet Union have therefore not been guided by sensitive signals such as are constantly being transmitted by costs and prices in a free market economy. To make matters worse, until recently, they were not even subject to correction by public criticism. Thus, economic success in the Soviet system came to be measured, traditionally, in terms of meeting targets set by the government, rather than in meeting the wants of consumers. This sometimes led to production of equipment that failed to work or to the output of some consumer goods far in excess of demand, while other goods continued to be in critically short supply. Such production might be expressed in a high rate of growth of GNP, but it did not spell progress in the elevation of living standards. In time, the waste involved in this process became a matter of grave concern to Soviet officials, particularly to economists and engineers.

As early as 1959, a Soviet econometrician, L. V. Kantorovich, pointed out that it might be advantageous if prices were allowed to play a bigger role in guiding the allocation of resources in the Soviet economy. Another Soviet economist, Professor Y. Liberman, proposed that profitability rather than achievement of planned targets be used as the measure of success or failure of productive enterprise.

Although the Soviet Union has tried some experiments with reforms along these lines, there has been no correction of the fundamental flaws of the Communist economic system either in the Soviet Union or in the satellite countries. In Czechoslovakia the frustration with the results of centralized decision-making, which reached a climax during the industrial recession of the sixties, was an important factor in the reform movement in 1967-68, but the courageous effort to rationalize the economy by giving greater play to individual decision-making was brought to an abrupt end by Soviet troops and tanks in the summer of 1968.

This result was no great surprise to those who recognized that the reforms required to rationalize the Soviet-style economic system would weaken, if not totally destroy, the political control wielded by the Communist party. Faced with a choice between introducing economic rationality and the maintenance of their political power, the Russian rulers chose power. Unless and until they are willing to change their approach, it seems likely that their own economy and that of their satellites will continue to lag far behind the United States and other advanced countries of the free world.

Japan, on the other hand, has relied on the free market system, and that system has served Japan well. The Ikeda ten-year income-doubling plan, whose goals have been so conspicuously exceeded, called for basic reliance on the private sector and on free market forces. The document which outlined the plan stated:

"In trying to achieve the economic policies contained in this plan, it is desirable for the Government to count on the originality and

devices of private enterprises and individuals. It should refrain, as far as possible, from taking direct control measures for the purpose."

The authors of the plan recognized, of course, that the government had the responsibility of helping to create a climate conducive to economic growth. They pointed out, in particular, that it was the duty of the government to stabilize the value of the currency and to minimize business fluctuations through proper application of overall fiscal and monetary policies. But they left no doubt about their determination that the conduct of production and marketing was to be determined by private enterprises acting on their own initiative, not through state enterprises or state controls.

Japan's faith in the free market system has paid handsome dividends. Yet there were many economists and statesmen at the time when Khrushchev made his extravagant predictions who took him seriously. They argued that freedom was a luxury that poor nations could ill afford, and that these countries would therefore need to resort to authoritarian control of economic activity, if not also to outright governmental ownership of industrial enterprises, in order to augment their income and wealth. And, in fact, a number of countries in Asia did adopt in varying degrees the policy of turning over to the government the decision-making functions that are performed by private citizens in countries that practice free enterprise.

Those who adopted this approach overlooked the fact that Adam Smith, the father of the idea that freedom was more conducive to economic growth than governmental control, had addressed himself to the problems of a nation that was then very poor and very underdeveloped—that is, to the England of 1776. Two hundred years ago, English peasants, living at a subsistence level without any of the benefits of modern industry or science to ameliorate their condition, were probably worse off than their counterparts in most of free Asia today. And the French peasants lived in even greater poverty than the English.

Adam Smith examined the results of governmental intervention into economic activity in 18th century England and France with a perceptive eye. He came to the conclusion that the inefficient use of resources that he observed could be remedied and that wealth could be augmented if individuals had greater freedom to manage their economic affairs as they saw fit, instead of being tied down by minute and exacting regulations prescribed by bureaucrats. He saw that detailed economic regulations, often laid down by authorities far removed from the actual operations or needs of industry and commerce, produced undesirable results even though they may have been, or actually were, well-intentioned. In time, as the force of Smith's logic and evidence won adherents among men of authority, his revolutionary ideas proved instrumental in sweeping away much of the irrationality that had retarded economic progress. This paved the way for the extraordinary increase in living standards that has occurred in the West in the past two centuries.

It has been said that those who will not learn from the errors of the past are frequently doomed to repeat them. This has been the fate of much of Asia in the period following World War II. The Communists took control of all of the mainland China, and for a time the world was told in glowing terms of the great economic transformation they were effecting there. Indeed, it was widely believed for a time that the great political contest in the world between the advocates of democracy and the advocates of dictatorship hinged on the ability of the democratic countries in Asia to perform as well as authoritarian China. The attention

of all Asia was reported to be riveted on this contest to demonstrate which system was economically superior.

THE FAILURE OF COMMUNIST CHINA'S GREAT LEAP FORWARD

The year 1958 was hailed as Communist China's "great leap forward." It was claimed that food output had been doubled in a single year, and that final victory had been achieved over hunger. However, these claims were soon exposed as wild exaggerations, as it became evident in 1959 and 1960 that serious food shortages had begun to reappear. Far from developing self-sufficiency in food and eliminating hunger, Communist China experienced critical food shortages in the early 1960's and was compelled to import huge quantities of grain from abroad to meet her requirements. The agricultural communes which had been so widely acclaimed as the realization of true communism were quietly abandoned or radically modified. Agriculture in China appears to have remained virtually stagnant throughout the 1960's. Although production figures have been withheld, the available evidence suggests that output may not even have kept pace with the increase in population. In the early 1960's, the food shortages were attributed by government officials to bad weather, but this excuse was soon dropped as food imports continued to be required year after year.

The failures of agriculture had serious effects throughout the Communist Chinese economy. It soon became necessary to retrench drastically the plans for industry and transportation. Resources were simply not available to push forward the grandiose schemes that were supposed to show the rest of Asia how a country could rise from agricultural poverty to industrial affluence by pursuing the Communist path. Official statistics on economic performance of Communist China became very scarce as the boasted "great leap forward" failed to materialize. Talk of competition between Communist China and free Asia dropped to a whisper once it became evident that the free countries were well ahead in the contest.

ECONOMIC SUCCESS IN FREE ASIA

The countries of Asia that have retained the free market system and have avoided the centralization of economic decisions in the hands of the government have clearly been winning the economic contest. The countries that have done the least well have tended to be the ones that either rejected the free market or severely limited it by governmental controls.

The great economic success stories of Asia in the 1960's are found in countries like Japan, the Republic of Korea, Nationalist China, Thailand, Hong Kong, and Malaysia. These countries, in the 10 years ending in 1968, have all recorded average increases in real output of 6 per cent a year or more. Japan, of course, has been one of the outstanding performers, with an average annual growth rate of 11 per cent in this period.

Rates of growth of GNP can be misleading, especially in countries where the underlying statistical data are inadequate and of doubtful validity. It is therefore desirable to check the growth figures of GNP against other records. One useful indicator of underlying growth is the trend of exports, since this is a measure of a nation's ability to compete in world markets. Export performance is a test of a country's efficiency in keeping up with the standards being set elsewhere in the world.

Professor Ota Sik, the architect of the short-lived economic reform in Czechoslovakia, called attention to the fact that the Communist economies have had great difficulty in meeting the test of economic efficiency posed by exports. As he put it: "On the foreign markets, Czechoslovak produc-

tion is absolutely unable to adjust to changes in demand." This has been largely due to the tendency to neglect quality in production. Over-priced, shoddy goods can be sold in a market that is shielded from foreign competition, but they have little chance in export markets.

It is significant, therefore, that the countries in Asia that have achieved high rates of overall economic growth have also done very well in expanding their exports. The whole world knows what an outstanding record Japan has piled up in export markets. In the period 1958-68, Japanese exports expanded at an average annual rate of 16 per cent a year. It is perhaps less well known that the Republic of Korea, Nationalist China, and Hong Kong have also expanded their exports at phenomenal rates.

There are fascinating stories behind the export statistics of free Asia. I have just come from Korea, and I am very impressed by the remarkable change that has taken place there in just the last decade. Korea's expansion of exports from almost nothing to over \$600 million last year is a modern miracle. I am also impressed by the fact that tiny Hong Kong, with a population of only 4 million, exported about as much as all of India in 1969.

The experience of these Asian countries in achieving such outstanding success in the face of what many people once thought were overwhelming odds illustrates how difficult it is for any economist, no matter how farsighted he may be, to chart the future course of a nation's development. I know that many of you could cite interesting examples from your own experience of the achievement of what once seemed practically impossible.

Some of you may recall the pessimism that prevailed in the years immediately after World War II about Japan's economic future. The development of nylon obviously posed a great threat to the future of silk, which had been one of Japan's leading exports before the war. No one foresaw at that time that Japan would become one of the world's great producers of synthetic fibers and fabrics and that Japan's exports of these goods would eventually far exceed the value of her prewar exports of silk.

Japan has demonstrated the shallowness of the belief that latecomers in economic development are unable to compete successfully with countries that have gotten a head start. I remember the late Prime Minister Ikeda telling me of the first tape recorder he had ever seen. It was on one of his visits to New York in the early 1950's. Neither he nor many of his compatriots then foresaw that tape recorders and other electronic products would play a major role in the tremendous expansion of Japanese exports that has occurred over the last decade.

One of the great strengths of a free economy is that it permits the development of the unexpected. Given proper incentives, the Japanese, the Chinese, and the Korean entrepreneurs have found new uses for their land, labor and capital. In many cases, the raw materials, such as wood for the plywood factories of Japan and Korea, had to be imported from distant lands. There were failures as well as successes, but the end result has been the rapid development of production and exports that had not been dreamed of, much less planned.

The lesson to be learned from these experiences is an old one. Where men are given the opportunity and the incentive to make and sell the products of their labor in free markets, they will tend to act in ways that increase productive efficiency and thereby raise the living standards of the country as a whole. To be sure, freedom of entrepreneurs, workers, and consumers to make their own decisions is by no means the sole determinant of how well a country will perform economically. A nation must also pursue sound mone-

tary, fiscal, and trade policies in order to achieve its economic potential. But there cannot be the slightest doubt, in view of the experience accumulated over centuries, that free and competitive markets are a major determinant of economic growth and widespread prosperity.

It is no accident that the Asian countries that experienced the slowest rates of growth in 1958-68 were also the countries that leaned most heavily on centralized economic controls. The countries at the bottom of the scale in terms of growth of real GNP include Ceylon, Burma, India, and Indonesia. Each of these countries has experimented extensively with government ownership or control over economic activities.

Burma in particular has gone far toward economic authoritarianism. By exercising far-reaching controls over production, trade, and finance, both its production and distribution have been injured. Burma's main crop, rice, has been adversely affected by pricing policies that have denied producers adequate incentives. Over the past decade, neighboring Thailand has increased rice exports by 28 per cent, while Burma's exports of rice have fallen nearly two-thirds. The result is that Burma's total exports are now running at less than half the 1963 level. The ability to import has fallen correspondingly.

Indonesia under President Sukarno followed economic policies that were in some respects more disastrous than those of Burma. In addition to establishing stifling controls over production and trade, Sukarno's government borrowed heavily abroad, largely to build up a military machine, but partly also to finance ambitious projects that in the end yielded little or no economic return. The productive capital of the country was therefore badly eroded, exports fell sharply, living standards declined, and the country found itself saddled with huge foreign debts and with diminished ability to produce the exports needed to service the debt. Fortunately, Indonesia is now in the process of liberalizing her economy, but the country will require many years to recuperate from the damage wrought by the Sukarno policies.

The adverse impact of authoritarian economic policies has also been felt in India, though to a much lesser degree than in either Burma or Indonesia. India over the past decade and a half has emphasized strong centralized control over investment, backed by extensive restrictions on imports and foreign exchange expenditures. Fortunately, the earlier decisions to emphasize heavy industry at the expense of light industry and agriculture are now being questioned. The failure to provide incentives to exports has left India lagging far behind many other countries, and has contributed to balance-of-payments difficulties which necessitated ever tighter import restrictions. As a result, India has passed through a difficult period during which many of her industrial enterprises were deprived of the supplies and equipment needed to keep operating at reasonable rates.

Division of labor, territorial specialization, freedom of trade, and decentralization of economic decision-making—these were key elements in the thinking of the founder of classical economics, Adam Smith. It is gratifying to see that the practical statesmen of the world are gradually rediscovering these essential truths. In this rediscovery of truth, we owe a debt to countries like Japan, the Republic of Korea, Nationalist China, Hong Kong, and Thailand that have most recently demonstrated how nations practicing economic freedom can outperform authoritarian countries.

I see a basis for optimism about the future in the economic experience of both the countries that have forged ahead and those that have lagged behind. What has gone wrong, after all, is not something immutable. A country can change its future, for the better, by changing its policies. The countries that

have lagged in the economic contests have the opportunity to learn from experience and to alter their course.

ECONOMIC ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES

In concentrating, as I have, on the power of free markets to spur economic growth, I am not unmindful of the responsibilities that the advanced industrialized countries have to assist the developing nations. We have, at times, overestimated our potential contribution. There has been a tendency to think that external technical assistance, or external capital, could of itself provide sufficient impetus to generate rapid growth all over the world.

We now know that the solutions are more complex. Nevertheless, technical assistance, capital flows, whether governmental or private, and liberal trade policies on the part of the industrialized countries can contribute significantly to the process of economic development.

It is even more important that the advanced countries maintain their own economic strength if the world economy as a whole is to prosper and international trade is to flourish. Clearly, the prosperity and growth of the developing countries depends heavily on the economic well-being of the advanced countries, which provide the major export markets as well as the principal source of the capital and technology required to promote rapid economic development.

I am fully aware of the importance of the role of the United States in keeping the world economy on a sound basis. At the present time, the exercise of our responsibilities in this regard requires that we bring an end to the inflationary pressures present in our own economy. This is proving to be a difficult task. As a result of restrictive monetary and fiscal policies pursued last year, the rate of economic expansion slowed appreciably and some lack has developed in markets for labor and other resources. However, while we have succeeded in eliminating excess demand in our economy, we are still experiencing rather strong upward pressures on costs and prices. Expectations of consumers, businesses, and workers have not yet fully adjusted to the current balance of aggregate demand and supply.

The continuance of rising costs and prices in the face of a sluggish economy has been deeply disturbing to many observers. Some have concluded that success in our battle against inflation might require so restrictive a monetary policy that a liquidity crisis could develop. Concern about this has given rise to some turbulence in our financial markets in recent weeks. Let me assure you that the Federal Reserve Board is fully aware of its responsibility to prevent anxieties of this kind from leading to a scramble for liquidity. Any such development could harm the world economy, as well as our own. Fortunately, we in the United States have the legislative authority, the tools, and—I believe—also the knowledge and wisdom to enable us to deal quickly and effectively with any problems of this nature that might emerge.

While the process of getting inflation under control in the United States has been difficult, there have been scattered signs recently of moderation in the rate of advance in some major categories of prices, and also of some improvement in the trend of productivity in the manufacturing sector of our economy. I believe we will be able to extend the progress that is beginning to emerge in these areas, by pursuing stabilization policies that prevent the reemergence of excess demand later in this year or in 1971. However, we must also be careful to ensure that the economic slowdown which began last fall does not become more pervasive or continue much longer. On this score, I think there is room for optimism too. Both monetary and fiscal policies have become less restrictive in

recent months, and I believe we may look forward with reasonable confidence to a resumption of sustainable economic growth in the near future, as well as to a gradual diminution in the rate of advance in prices.

For a time, however, we must expect to see a continuation of cost-push inflation, with increases in wage rates and prices reflecting the excess demand that existed in the past, the effects of which have not yet fully worked their way through the economic system. There are some who think that, under the circumstances, we should abandon our traditional reliance on market forces and impose mandatory controls on wages and prices to halt inflation. I have always been strongly opposed to direct controls, since they are discriminatory and a source of great inefficiency. But I think the Administration has taken a proper step in announcing the establishment of a procedure to review the economic implications of wage and price increase in key industries. In a transitional period of cost-plus inflation, such as we are now experiencing, the moderate incomes policy recently announced by the President should help us to avoid an increase in unemployment and yet hasten the return to reasonable price stability.

The task of bringing inflation under control has caused, and will continue to cause, some discomfort in many sectors of our economy. The anti-inflationary program pursued in the United States has had repercussions which have even extended as far as Japan, I understand. However, I can assure you that our economy is fundamentally sound and resilient. Just as I had confidence that the lulls in Japanese growth that I observed on some of my earlier visits were only temporary, so I have confidence that economic growth and progress will be resumed in the United States in the near future. We are still a long way from having exhausted the possibilities of improving our standard of living or increasing our productive capacity.

Man has taken a giant step forward in entering the era of interplanetary exploration. Our technology and education will continue to advance. How well the industrial countries or the less-developed countries use new knowledge to better man's lot in life will depend on many things. It will depend in part on the goals that we set for ourselves. It will depend in part on our ability to live together in peace and to maintain the kind of mutually beneficial relations that have existed between Japan and the United States for nearly a quarter of a century. It will depend on the willingness of the advanced nations to assist those that have lagged behind in the economic contest. But it will also depend in important measure on the extent to which the nations of the world recognize the great advantages of the free market system and are willing to pursue fiscal, monetary, and commercial policies that are compatible with its efficient operation.

OIL IMPORT QUOTA POLICY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, this Nation now stands at a most important crossroads in the establishment of sound policies which will insure the power resources required to meet our growing needs and maintain our national security. The issue quite plainly is whether we will choose to remain energy sufficient or whether we will choose to become energy dependent.

At present, the Nation, with only 6 percent of the world's population, consumes some 40 percent of the energy produced in the free world. Our consumption, moreover, is going to increase.

While three-quarters of the energy we consume is derived from petroleum resources, our domestic petroleum industry

faces growing economic difficulties. Simultaneously, our national security continues to rest to a significant degree upon a healthy domestic oil industry.

National security demands that we have available the fuel reserves necessary to propel our Armed Forces when necessary and to maintain the mobility which is now so vital to military strength. But it means more than that. It means, also, worldwide bargaining power. We must maintain that international bargaining strength which is based upon the knowledge that this Nation can supply our own energy needs and those required to meet our commitments. Thus, national security includes the capability to provide for vital industrial and consumer needs.

We will require tremendous quantities of petroleum during the next 15 years. We are expected to consume 100 billion barrels of oil and 420 trillion cubic feet of gas by 1985. This is an amount equal to all the oil consumed in the United States from the discovery of oil in 1859 through 1967 and 80 trillion cubic feet of gas more than we have consumed to date.

It is thus clear that we must not jeopardize our supplies. In the past, operating under appropriate economic incentives, our capable domestic industry supplied this Nation with all the oil products it could consume. This is a fundamental reason this Nation is a leading world power today.

The continued ability of the domestic industry to supply these tremendous and vital needs depends on three elements: the existence of adequate undiscovered domestic reserves, continuation of economic incentive sufficient to encourage more exploration for these reserves, and the availability of the technical expertise, trained men and modern facilities necessary to find, produce, refine, and transport the oil products to the consumer. If these elements are present, there is no question that we can supply our needs.

We have the necessary reserves. The U.S. Geological Survey estimated undiscovered crude oil in place exceeds 2 trillion barrels within the United States and its continental shelves to a depth of 200 isobaths. This represents possibly a 200-year supply at present rates of consumption. Continued increasing rates of consumption, of course, shorten that supply. The Potential Gas Committee estimated that not less than 1,227 trillion cubic feet of gas remain to be discovered in the United States of which 260 trillion cubic feet are in existing fields and another 335 trillion cubic feet are in known producing areas.

It has been suggested that we save our petroleum resources by importing large amounts of oil from other countries. This step, however, would so weaken our exploration industry that we could not rely upon it to discover our vast domestic reserves. Revitalization of this capability would take many years. In practice, once we become dependent upon foreign oil, we will always be dependent upon it.

This is so for two reasons: Irreparable physical damage to the producing geologic formation and displacement of the personnel engaged in the exploration

segment of the industry. When wells are shut-in for protracted periods of time, water encroaches, the formation may swell, and rust, scale and paraffin accumulate on the face of the formation. Once this occurs, production is either lost forever or materially reduced.

The exploration segment of the industry is composed of highly skilled specialists in fields such as seismology, geophysics, geology, and drilling and producing engineering to name a few. These specialists would be forced to seek employment in other industries. Even if the economic incentives were later restored, there is no assurance that these experts would return to the oil industry having made commitments elsewhere. And if they could return, there would be a time lag of several years from the beginning of the search for new reserves to shipping the crude and natural gas to market.

Today, the men, expertise, and facilities necessary to obtain crude oil exist. Because they do, this Nation enjoys a product price which has risen much less than the prices of most other commodities. This is true even though the industry has borne increased taxes and costs of production from the wellhead to the gas pump. The retail price of gasoline has risen only 13.8 percent since the 1957-59 base period, compared with 20.5 percent for all other commodities. The consumer price of natural gas is at virtually the same place it was during the depression. Our petroleum industry has done its job well.

It is clear, then, that adequate reserves, labor, expertise and facilities to supply our Nation's needs do exist. Thus the only essential element in doubt is the continued existence of proper economic incentives to assure that the labor, expertise and facilities available are used to discover and develop these reserves.

When the proper incentives are eliminated, it is easy to see what happens. For example, because the FPC has failed to recognize the need for a higher price for natural gas during past years, there has not been sufficient exploration and development of this resource to avoid the danger of an acute shortage of natural gas. Because the price of natural gas was held at artificially low levels for so long, there may not be sufficient natural gas available this summer and winter to meet the needs of users in some areas of the United States. This is particularly unfortunate, Mr. President, when one considers that natural gas is the one fuel which does not pollute the environment. If the FPC had earlier recognized the necessity of providing the proper incentives to the petroleum industry, in the form of a realistic price for natural gas, the Nation would not face a shortage of this fuel today.

Mr. President, we cannot afford to repeat these mistakes. We cannot be lulled into accepting the argument that short-term economic gains to the United States would occur if we eliminate the mandatory oil import quota system. If we do so, we will risk destroying an important segment of our economy and perhaps gain nothing for it. Many of the economic and consumer benefits which have been promised if the mandatory oil

import quota system is eliminated are illusory.

The Task Force report to the President on the "Relationship of Oil Imports to the National Economy" advocated eliminating the present oil import quota system. We must not abandon this known, workable system unless we are certain that positive results will occur. This is especially important since we are dealing with an industry as basic and vital to the Nation's health and security as the domestic petroleum industry. Reasonable, well-founded assumptions must be the basis for such a change. Consider the likely consequences of a decision to rely entirely on imported crude for our needs.

First, as increased imports drive the price of crude down, the oil and gas exploration segment of the domestic industry would rapidly become nonexistent. There would be an accompanying loss of 268,000 jobs directly connected with the exploration of oil and gas and \$750 million of taxes each year. Since the exploration for gas is inextricably bound to that of oil, a point virtually ignored in the report, we would very soon be substantially without gas. Therefore, we would be forced to import nearly all our needs of 20 trillion cubic feet of gas per year. The fact that natural gas must be compressed under high pressure into a liquid to be shipped adds substantially to its cost. The additional cost is approximately twice as much as that produced here. This increased cost would amount to over \$5 billion per year. This is the amount which the report estimated would be saved by the U.S. consumer by importing cheaper foreign oil.

Further, the foreign supplies of crude and liquefied natural gas could be shut off at will by the producer governments or even be halted through acts beyond the control of those governments. Bearing in mind that there is no substitute for petroleum, a total stoppage of the flow for whatever reason might well shut down the entire transportation industry—aircraft, truck, train, boat and auto movements could be drastically curtailed. Other industries would then cease to operate. Agriculture, which is becoming increasingly mechanized, would grind to a halt. Tens of millions of Americans would be without heat in their homes. Our economy would be in utter chaos and personal misery would prevail. Granted, this is a pessimistic picture. But I suggest that it is a far more accurate picture of the economic disturbance this Nation would suffer than that presented by the Task Force report.

But, Mr. President, this situation will not happen as long as there are sufficient economic incentives for producing hydrocarbons in the United States. The security and reliability of our supply is worth a price.

For what savings has the Task Force recommended a change, that if wrong, could wreak such havoc? Eight-tenths of 1 cent per gallon hydrocarbon consumed. Even if this is accurate, I submit that this is not an excessive amount for the U.S. consumer to pay to assure the continued supply of fuel and a firm national security.

But assuming for the sake of discussion that the supplier countries relied

on by the Task Force report will be politically willing and physically able to deliver, I question their ability to discover and prepare for market enough new reserves to satisfy our needs.

The task force cited the North Slope of Alaska, Canada, and Latin America as our main sources of supply. The ability of these areas to deliver was seriously challenged recently in testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee by an eminently qualified authority on the subject—M. A. Wright, chairman of the Board of Humble Oil & Refining Co. He estimated that by 1980 the production from the Alaskan North Slope would be 2 million barrels per day—1.7 million barrels per day less than the amount stipulated in the report. This province is just too new and untested. Referring to the ability of Canada to deliver to us 1.6 million barrels per day, he estimated that Canada would have to find and ready for market 25 billion barrels of new reserves in the next 10 years. This is more than twice the amount found there in the past 20 years and an overly optimistic prediction by the task force. The ability of the Latin American countries to deliver the 2.7 million barrels per day as called for in the report was based largely on the assumption that Venezuela could produce a total of 5.4 million barrels per day. Mr. Wright estimates on the basis of on-the-ground experience and observations of his subsidiary companies, the 1980 Venezuelan production will remain at about the present level of 3.6 million barrels per day. These views differ by 50 percent. As to Eastern Hemisphere imports, Wright and the task force assumed a balancing of the U.S. demand from these unstable sources after first drawing on available Western Hemisphere supplies. Based on his calculations of the U.S. demand and Western Hemisphere supplies, he estimated that we would be importing 6.5 million barrels per day from the Eastern Hemisphere instead of the 500,000 barrels per day in the task force report.

Without laboring the point further, I think it can be seen that we must proceed slowly to change when the experts differ so widely on the basic assumptions of the source of supply impact on the Nation and saving to the consumer.

I suggest we consider enacting into law the present import quota system. Open and complete hearings would allow correcting its minor flaws as we do so. Furthermore, congressional hearings should be held as President Nixon suggested when he received the report.

Finally, we must recognize the outstanding accomplishments of our industry which has served the Nation so well in the past. I, for one, have great admiration for the men who stand ready today to risk the necessary capital to assure us of a continued, secure supply of this precious commodity. We in Congress must do our part to provide a stable economic climate in which these men can operate.

REPRESENTATIVE ALLARD LOWENSTEIN

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, ALLARD LOWENSTEIN is waging an uphill

fight in New York to retain his congressional seat. Although his Nassau County district was gerrymandered, Representative LOWENSTEIN has refused to step aside despite the odds against him.

This type of determination symbolizes ALLARD LOWENSTEIN's commitment to the people of his district and his willingness to do battle for the ideals in which he believes.

I ask unanimous consent that James A. Wechsler's column entitled "A Bigger Battle" published in the New York Post of April 15, 1970, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A BIGGER BATTLE

Once again Allard Lowenstein has undertaken the "impossible" fight. His adversaries must be at least slightly shaken by his decision; his gift for confounding the odds has been demonstrated too often.

In choosing to run for reelection to Congress from a district cynically gerrymandered to force his retirement, Lowenstein is again defying all the calculations of the "pros". He may also have set the stage for another upset with large national repercussions.

The battleground is Nassau County's reshuffled Fifth Congressional District. When 41-year-old Lowenstein, the rebel-at-large who sparked the national Democratic political upsurge of 1968, first ran for Congress against a Republican backed Conservative that year, few conceded him any chance of victory. He won.

When the Republican statesman gathered behind closed doors last winter, he was a major target of their shabby "redistricting" maneuvers. By the time they were finished, the heart of Lowenstein's strength—Nassau's Five Towns—was severed from his district.

It was clearly the GOP expectation that Lowenstein would take the hint, either by entering the crowded Democratic Senate primary or bidding for a Congressional seat in more congenial territory.

Instead, on Monday night, he announced that he would fight it out on the newly-drawn lines. This time he faces what seem like significantly graver handicaps than he did in his first race. It is exactly the kind of encounter in which he flourishes and will rally the new generation of political veterans who won their battle stars at an early age in the Kennedy-McCarthy uprising.

Lowenstein and his young wife Jennie agonized for many weeks over the decision. Many of his supporters, in Nassau County and other areas, were imploring him to seek the Senate nomination; their entreaties mounted after the Democratic tumult in the Catskills. Lowenstein was especially moved by the voices of students who have been turned on by other aspirants and were prepared to make his Senate candidacy the "New Hampshire" of 1970. But this was not just a youth movement; he was receiving similar appeals from numerous Democrats who felt he could impart new life to a leaden atmosphere—both as a campaigner and as the ultimate occupant of the late Robert Kennedy's seat.

An ordinary political man would almost certainly have yielded to these pressures. In the scrambled Democratic Senate primary, Lowenstein's legion of adherents and own qualities of spirit would give him special advantage; he would have been a favorite over Goodell in the finals. The alternative was a grim uphill Congressional contest in a district redesigned for his discomfort.

In the end he chose the harder, less glamorous road. It was no political masochism that led to this decision—one he did not finally reach until a few moments before Monday night's Democratic county meeting.

It was based on judgments consistent with his whole history as a special breed of political man.

For one thing, he instinctively rejects the notion of backing away from the challenge embodied in the gerrymander. . . . He has a capacity for transforming a local clash into a national plebiscite. His opponent—State Senator Norman E. Lent—is a faithful follower of the Nixon-Agnew establishment on Vietnam and a cautious political trimmer on many other matters. Lowenstein sees the election as a clear test of the "silent majority" legend—rendered peculiarly dramatic by the gerrymander.

Yet Lowenstein's decision might have been different if he had sharp ideological conflicts with the Democrats already in the Senate field and if he regarded Goodell as an unreconstructed reactionary. In the last analysis, however, his declaration for the Senate would have required him to proclaim that he alone had the distinctive human qualifications that would fill a vacuum in the Democratic campaign.

Lowenstein, whatever his reservations about the announced Democrats—and Goodell was ultimately unable to imitate those who affirm their own indispensability. No matter how many people have told him that he is the man of the Senatorial hour, he could not visualize a venture that seemed to rest on that premise. And he would have been further troubled by the sense that he had picked a self-indulgent way of a hard fight in Nassau County.

Concerned about youths who may feel let down by his decision he believes that what he has already depicted as his test of "mini-Agnewism" will enlist their energies. He is at his best when unencumbered by doubts about his mission; he knows he has been faithful to his own concept of political responsibility and his distaste for any course that seems to rationalize private ambition. Lowenstein's presence insures that his new battle will be memorable.

POLLUTION AND A CONCERNED PUBLIC

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, in an excellent article published in the July issue of *Current History* magazine, Senator GAYLORD NELSON, of Wisconsin, discusses the environmental crisis in the broad context, pointing that pollution knows no boundaries. He stresses the need for metropolitan, regional, national, and even international cooperation to solve these complex and pervasive problems. Further, he points out that what must provide the backbone of such efforts is an enlightened, active citizenry that insists on steps to protect the environment and the quality of human life. The article is very informative. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

POLLUTION AND A CONCERNED PUBLIC (By GAYLORD NELSON)

("A concerned public holds the key to eventual success for environmental efforts. Without a sustained effort by millions of citizens, the best administered programs can fail.")

Rarely has anything been more romanticized than the air pollution of "foggy" Londontown. Victorian English literature would not have been the same without the London fog. Charles Dickens wrote of black soot particles which resembled snowflakes "gone into mourning for the death of the sun." T. S. Eliot wrote about the "yellow fog that rubs its back upon the window panes." Joseph Conrad and other novelists wrote books

in which London's fog played a prominent part.

But today London's fog has virtually disappeared—and literature is the only loser. Only some three or four times a year does anything remotely resembling the fog of yore descend on the city and, even then, it is never the suffocating and sometimes lethal fog that it used to be.

The catalyst for a mammoth clean-up program was supplied by a disastrous smog that hit London in December, 1952, lasting for three days and killing 4,000 persons. This grim occurrence led to the Clean Air Act of 1956, which brought the gradual creation of smoke-control areas across the entire United Kingdom. Now, 74 per cent of London is covered by the control orders banning the burning of soft coal, and 80 per cent less smoke is emitted by homes and factories than was the case in 1952.

As a result, researchers say that the health of London's citizens has improved; the weather is much more pleasant and enjoyable to residents and tourists alike; and the clean air has inspired the scrubbing of such celebrated structures as the Tower of London, the National Gallery, Nelson's Column in Trafalgar Square, Westminster Abbey, St. Paul's Cathedral, and Buckingham Palace. In addition, plants and wildlife are thriving and long-absent birds have reappeared on the scene—138 species today compared with less than half that number 10 years ago.

London is a shining example of a city that tackled its air pollution problem successfully, with the help of a national Clean Air Act. But it cannot afford to rest its efforts now. While it still basks in the sunny success of its recent efforts, the auto boom threatens to return the city in the next few years to the days of haze. In an effort to meet that problem before it reaches crisis proportions, England has become the first country to put the electric auto into mass production.

In the United States, where the automobile causes 60 per cent of the country's air pollution (up to 90 per cent in some cities), the state of California in 1960 pioneered air pollution control legislation. And none too soon: with knowing looks at the growing clouds of smog, natives whispered that the end was near—the birds in Los Angeles had begun to cough.

By 1965, thanks to the spadework in California, the auto industry could no longer avoid federal legislation. The 1968 models were the first to be affected, and more stringent federal controls were required of 1970 and 1971 models. Further smog reductions, which will leave our air cleaner, have been mapped out through 1980.

In the process, the internal combustion engine may have to go by the boards. A bill I introduced in the Senate would ban the internal combustion engine in 1978 if it does not meet certain emission standards. The bill provides for the development of alternatives to the internal combustion engine by 1976, the 200th anniversary of this country's independence.

The London and Los Angeles examples show that statewide, regional and national legislation is needed to deal with the environmental crisis. By nature, pollution problems span governmental jurisdictions, requiring cooperative action at all levels of government.

A NATIONWIDE PROBLEM

DDT sprayed on crops is carried far afield by wind and erosion and is absorbed by every living creature all over the world. It threatens the very survival of many species. Petroleum spilled from the U.S. Steel plant at the southern tip of Lake Michigan helps pollute the shores of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan and Wisconsin. Atomic radiation and nerve gas are carried by vagrant winds from testing sites to grazing land and even to metropolitan areas. Cities can dump raw sewage into a river flowing through them and extend the problem to all cities downstream.

Economic pressure on local units of government is particularly heavy. Sometimes allowing an industry to enter an area with an eye to the taxes it will pay is the only alternative a small community has to an unwanted jump in the general tax rate. Often an already present industry is the backbone of the community's economy and its interests influence decisions made by the local government. For example, Pima County, Arizona passed an air pollution ordinance that was high minded and effective in all but one respect: it exempted the copper smelting plants which are responsible for 90 per cent of the local air pollution.

Following the Federal Clean Air Act of 1967, Nevada adopted an air pollution control law which air pollution control officials described as "industry oriented." Since 1967, in Clark County (which includes Las Vegas), more than 1,000 "notices of violation" of even the mild existing regulations have been issued. Of these, only 35 cases have gone to court, and among these, there have been only three convictions. The highest fine imposed was \$75.

Of course, political, bureaucratic and economic realities are not always the deciding factors in determining the success of anti-pollution measures.

Los Angeles has used a very successful formula for reducing industrial pollution: it offers the pollution sources a reasonable time to install fume control equipment or stop operating. Unfortunately, too many government units take the approach of imposing "after-the-fact" sanctions in which officials have to wait until a facility actually contaminates the air before beginning tortuous abatement proceedings that can end in no more than citation for a misdemeanor.

It is an encouraging aspect of the environmental picture that the public has begun to play an active part. Public opinion in action saved the San Francisco Bay from property owners who wanted to extend their land into the bay, and from the city of Berkeley which proposed to increase its size greatly by filling in 2,000 acres of the bay.

As reported in the April, 1970, issue of *The Progressive*,

"What happened next was an inspiring example of the power of an angry citizenry when aroused by a ruthless assault upon the environment. Mrs. Clark Kerr, wife of the then president of the University of California, and two friends enlisted the aid of the Sierra Club, the Save the Redwoods League, the Audubon Society, and other groups to save the Bay. The Save San Francisco Bay Association was formed and with the support of thousands of citizens defeated the Berkeley Bay fill plan by making it a local election issue.

"From this success, the Association went on to a broader approach. It lined up some key leaders of the California legislature and with massive citizen support succeeded in getting a bill passed that created a Bay Conservation and Development Commission to explore ways of developing San Francisco Bay's maximum values without harming its scenic or recreational potential. A key provision of the law prohibits any new fill during the Commission's three-year study without a public hearing and Commission approval.

"There was influential opposition to the legislation but Association members turned out en masse at Sacramento when the bill was before the legislature, flooded lawmakers with petitions, letters, telephone calls, and telegrams. Some inventive Oakland citizens mailed small bags of sand to their legislators with tags that read: 'You'll wonder where the water went, if you fill the Bay with sediment.'"

"The Commission's report, submitted in January, 1969, declared that the Bay must be protected as an asset belonging to the people of the area, state and nation. Powerful interests are lobbying against the Com-

mission's position, but the citizens who halted the real estate developers and the industrial demand for land fills realize that while they have won a major battle, the war to save the Bay still goes on."¹

In another example of the power of the public, the voters of New York in November, 1969, approved in a general election a constitutional amendment that gave the state government new powers and responsibility to stop air and water pollution, end unnecessary noise, and protect wetlands, shorelines and other priceless resources from reckless development and exploitation. The amendment passed by a margin of five to one, the greatest margin for any constitutional change in the history of New York. Other states, including Illinois, Massachusetts, Colorado and Maryland, are now embarked on similar attempts at legislation.

Other citizen efforts, notably the ones to save Seattle's Lake Washington and Florida's Everglades, have met with success. The concept is gaining that nature belongs to the people and that encroachments on it or degradations of it are contrary to the public interest.

A Gallup Poll taken for the National Wildlife Federation last year revealed that 51 per cent of all persons interviewed were deeply disturbed about the grim tide of pollution.

Growing student concern about the environment is a striking new development. A freshman college student attitude poll, conducted last fall by the American Council on Education, found that 89.9 per cent of all male freshmen believed that the federal government should be more involved in the control of pollution.

EFFECTS ON CONGRESS

Other national and local polls, the rising citizen attendance at public hearings on polluters, the letters that are pouring into Congressional offices—all indicate a vast new concern. As a dramatic indication of the degree to which the new citizen concern has reached Congress, more requests for information on environment come into the Legislative Reference Service (the research arm of Congress) than any other issue, including the traditional front-runners, crime and Vietnam.

In the *Congressional Record*, the amount of environmental material inserted in 1969 by Senators and Congressmen was exceeded only by material on Vietnam.

Congress in 1969 took the major initiative of appropriating \$800 million in federal water pollution control funds—nearly four times the request of the present and previous administrations.

Concern for the environment has only recently jumped to the fore in the United States, but there can be no question that it has become an issue of paramount importance, with enormous public support. When I proposed a national Environmental Teach-In in September, 1969, in a speech in Seattle, I hoped for a good response but did not anticipate one so overwhelming—extending to 2,000 colleges, 10,000 high schools and 2,000 town halls across the nation. Nor did I expect that the movement would be endorsed by such divergent groups as the United Auto Workers and the American Library Association.

The nation has begun to recognize a disturbing new paradox: The mindless pursuit of quantity is destroying—not enhancing—the opportunity to achieve quality in our lives. In the words of the American balladeer, Pete Seeger, we have found ourselves "standing knee deep in garbage, throwing rockets at the moon." Cumulatively, Progress American Style adds up each year to 172 million tons of smoke and fumes, seven million junked cars, 100 million discarded tires, 20 million tons of paper, 48 billion cans, and

28 billion bottles. It also means bulldozers gnawing away at the landscape to make room for more unplanned expansion, more leisure time but less open space in which to spend it, and so much reckless progress that we face even now a hostile environment.

Today it can be said that there is no pure air left in the United States. Scientists are in general agreement that the last vestige of pure air was consumed near Flagstaff, Arizona, about six years ago.

Today it can also be said that there is no river or lake in the country that has not been affected by the pervasive wastes of our society. On Lake Superior, the last clean Great Lake, a mining company is dumping 60,000 tons of iron ore process wastes a day directly into the lake.

Tomorrow? Responsible scientists have predicted that if they are not checked, accelerating rates of air pollution could become so serious by the 1980's that in many cities people may be forced on the worst days to wear breathing helmets to survive outdoors.

It has also been predicted that in 20 years man will live in domed cities. Paul Ehrlich, an eminent California ecologist, and many other scientists predict the end of the oceans as a productive resource within the next 50 years unless pollution is stopped. The United States provides an estimated one-third to one-half of the industrial pollution of the sea. It is especially ironic that, even as we pollute the sea, there is hope that its resources can be used to feed tens of millions of hungry people.

In the face of it all, we must carry in our minds continually the chilling awareness that the fate of mankind itself may hang in the balance. If man can push hundreds of other species off the face of the earth, he can write his own obituary, too.

The sharpest indication that man can degrade his environment enough to threaten his own existence is that already he has caused the extinction of other species. S. Dillon Ripley, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C., believes that in 25 years somewhere between 75 and 80 per cent of all the species of living animals will be extinct.

Until recent years, species vanished at the rate of one per thousand years. At present, one species is dying out every year. For example, in just 100 years we exterminated five billion passenger pigeons.

The World Health Organization estimates that in the last 100 years over 550 species of mammals, birds and reptiles have been pushed to the brink of extinction. Unlike the dinosaur, which died out over a time span of millions of years, endangered species today are being wiped out in a second of geologic time. One hundred and ten kinds of mammals alone have succumbed in the Christian era, 70 per cent of them in the last century.

At present, the Department of the Interior's Office of Endangered Species has placed 89 creatures on the endangered list and has listed another 44 as rare. Included are the eastern timber wolf, the grizzly bear, the key deer, the jaguar, the American peregrine falcon, the whooping crane and the lake sturgeon.

An alarming aspect of this situation is the insidious way in which species are eradicated. No one wishes for their deaths. The Bermuda petrel, a rare oceanic bird of the North Atlantic that has no contact with any land treated with insecticides, nevertheless, lays eggs with 6.4 parts per million of DDT residues, acquired through eating contaminated sealife. Similarly, the eagle and the osprey face extinction because herbicides diminish their capacity to produce calcium and their eggs are no longer strong enough to contain the chicks.

The fate of the creatures cannot be decided through legislation, because the birds pay no attention to boundary lines. Some

countries, notably Sweden and Denmark and, recently, Canada, have banned DDT. But that is just a beginning. Soil erosion, the tide and the chain of life itself carry pesticides to the farthest reaches of the world without regard to boundaries. In Antarctica, as remote a spot as there is in the world, 2,600 tons of DDT are estimated to have accumulated in the snow and ice.

Man is a more adaptable creature than many of the species he has endangered. He manages to survive in Arctic igloos, in steamy tropical jungles and in cities of concrete and steel. But adaptable as he is, he is part of the ecological system and by damaging the system he can make earth uninhabitable for himself.

JURISDICTIONAL CONFLICTS

The battle against pollution must overcome the jurisdictional boundary lines that carve the planet into separate sovereignties. The urban sprawl centered in Portland, Oregon, has 452 municipalities—local governments that under normal conditions operate without regard to one another; other metropolitan areas have similar jurisdictional difficulties. The problems are compounded when they are encountered on the international scene.

Some examples dramatically point up the need for international solutions to pollution problems:

An oil tanker from Country X ruptures a seam, and oil gushes out to mar the beauty of Country Y's beaches and to kill its sea fowl, marine life and underwater vegetation;

Rising acidity in rain and snow, attributed to wastes from Britain and possibly West Germany, threaten to destroy freshwater fish and forests in Norway if not controlled;

Radioactivity from an atom test in Country A spreads to far-off Country B, imperiling Country B's milk products;

Chemicals used by a large power at war in a small country create a fear that the chemicals may sterilize the land or at least drastically reduce its agricultural output for many years, or even permanently.

A report issued by the Secretary General of the United Nations in May, 1969, found a need for international agreement in the areas of radioactive fallout; protection across boundary lines for migratory birds, mammals and reptiles; and agreements in matters affecting the weather and climate.

These international problems fall within the purview of the United Nations. They are non-ideological in nature, and they affect all the inhabitants of the world, human and otherwise. The U.N. Conference on Human Environment to be held in Stockholm in 1972 is a major first step toward using the United Nations to solve international pollution problems.

A study body operating under the auspices of the United Nations and funded by it would be a good start for a continuing attempt to monitor global environmental problems and to initiate proposals for meeting them.

To the extent that borders and political and economic interests are allowed to fragment and to weaken efforts to overcome environmental problems, those attempts will fail. But a very important ingredient in the battle to win back a quality environment is the will of the people, and the will is clearly present. It is now within the power of the people to elect to office candidates with strong environmental programs and deny office to those who are lukewarm on the environment.

Any rational approach to pollution or conservation matters requires the elimination of national and local rivalries. People the world over must start to think of one another as brothers with common afflictions and common needs.

Together, we can elect environmentally-committed candidates and then demand that they work for a quality environment. A con-

¹ *The Progressive*, April, 1970, pp. 62-63.

cerned public holds the key to eventual success for environmental efforts. Without a sustained effort by millions of citizens, the best administered programs can fail.

The goal is obvious: We must stop being a nation of conspicuous consumers and become a nation of conscientious conservers. We must spurn non-returnable bottles, demand biodegradable packaging, buy those products with the longest life expectancy, drive cars of reasonable size that do not spew tons of unnecessary pollutants into the air, and refuse to use detergents that will go from cleaning our homes to polluting our environment.

We have just begun to realize what we as individuals can do. We must not pass the buck. We must act on the fact that our security is again threatened—not from the outside, but from the inside—not by our enemies, but by ourselves. As Pogo quaintly puts it, "We have met the enemy and they are us."

INTERVIEW OF SENATOR FULBRIGHT ON "FACE THE NATION"

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations appeared on the CBS television broadcast "Face the Nation."

As he always is, Senator FULBRIGHT was insightful, cogent, and concise as he responded to his questioners, and I think his comments deserve the attention of his colleagues.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the telecast be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"FACE THE NATION": AS BROADCAST OVER THE CBS TELEVISION NETWORK AND THE CBS RADIO NETWORK, SUNDAY, JULY 5, 1970

Mr. HERMAN. Senator Fulbright, President Nixon last week compared the Cambodian action with Stalingrad and the invasion of Normandy—decisive battles of World War II. Do you see it in that kind of light?

Senator FULBRIGHT. No, I'm afraid I do not. There really wasn't any battle in that sense. It was an incursion which I'm afraid now that he has withdrawn he has left us in a much more vulnerable and exposed position than we were before.

With responsibilities that can be much greater, that is the support of Thai troops, the Vietnamese activities and it has spread—the occupation—the area occupied by the Communists is far greater than it was before. I don't think that at all.

ANNOUNCER. From CBS Washington in Color, "Face the Nation" a spontaneous and unrehearsed news interview with the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—Senator J. William Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas.

Senator Fulbright will be questioned by CBS News Diplomatic Correspondent Marvin Kalb, Neil MacNeil Chief Congressional Correspondent of Time Magazine and CBS News Correspondent, George Herman.

Mr. HERMAN. Senator Fulbright in that same question and answer period with the President on television, Mr. Nixon under questioning refused to commit himself to the final statement that we would never go back into Cambodia.

Do you think that the Senate or the Congress can and should take some action to nall that down?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, the Cooper-Church Amendment assuming it can be

passed into law would be the best restraint that I can think of in that it would make it illegal to spend money to do it.

But I agree that the Executive in recent years has shown a disposition to ignore the Constitution as well as the expression of the will by the Congress.

And it is a very difficult matter to make our Constitutional system work unless each of the branches has respect for the other and it followed the traditions of respecting the other's capacity.

If it comes to where you have to—where it's a matter of enforcement, obviously the Executive Branch can overrule both of the others because they control the Army and the Armed Forces and if it comes to that it means the complete loss of your constitutional democracy.

I don't expect it to come to that but I do think that the Church-Cooper Resolution—that is the Amendment to the Arms Sales Bill if it is respected would prevent the President going back into Cambodia.

Mr. MACNEIL. Senator, in public relations terms, in terms of the popularity poll, how do you argue with the success as President Nixon has called it of the Cambodian military venture?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, this is what we were speaking of earlier.

The television has given the President almost an exclusive access to the minds of the public of this country. I mean it is not that this program won't have some viewers but there is no program that compares to prime time with a Presidential address—there just isn't anything comparable to it.

And he can tell them these stories about the success which I think have no foundation and there is no way really to enlighten them. That's why you get these polls that have no relation to reality.

Mr. KALB. Senator, the President has appointed a new Ambassador to the Paris Peace Talks, Ambassador David Bruce.

Do you believe that this new Ambassador will be able to break the negotiating deadlock in Paris?

Senator FULBRIGHT. He's a very fine man. I've known him many years as everyone has in Government and he couldn't have picked a better man.

But neither he nor anyone else can do anything in Paris without a change in the attitude on the part of our Government.

Mr. KALB. What kind of change, Senator?

Senator FULBRIGHT. The acceptance of terms for the settlement which would be acceptable to the enemy which means in my view that then you would have to let the present Government of Viet Nam re-establish its basis with an open election which is not supervised and controlled by us or by them.

Some form of a free election there which would be satisfactory to the other side. The enemy accepted that principal in 1954. I am not sure they would now but we've never really offered it.

We've never offered it. We've used words sounding like that but they always were based upon the assumption of the present Government in South Viet Nam continuing to govern.

Mr. MACNEIL. Senator, if that is so, what purpose do the Paris Peace talks have at this point without such a change in our Government?

Is it merely window dressing?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, I've always had the hopes that there would be a change in our attitude. I've hoped—the main things we do in the Congress or try—that is, I do and my colleagues—to try to persuade the previous Administration and this Administration that this war is not in the interest of this country.

That we are sacrificing our own people and the interests of our own country for this

illusion about the interests of bringing free elections to the people of South Viet Nam—is the current words they use, which I don't think really are the real reasons, but I think that this war is in the interest of and enhances the Communist people, the Russians and the Chinese.

I think in the light of history it will be shown that the confidence of most of the world including ourselves in our own system—in our own maturity and judgment has been greatly undermined by this adventure.

The European countries—countries all over the world are losing confidence in our judgment. This is a very serious thing and at the same time our influence is diminishing and here at home where our whole society is deteriorating.

Mr. HERMAN. Senator, you said a moment ago that the balance has shifted, the President has so much weight because of his ability to go to the people.

But how about a United States Senate? Now the United States Senate has been debating for some time where to go, what to do in Cambodia and Viet Nam and it's hardly come to a straight, clear decision of any kind yet.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, we had two very satisfactory votes. You understand the nature of democracy which we profess a belief in, although we don't practice it particularly in many ways.

But, we believe in it; I believe in it. And we had two votes within the last two weeks that did show in my view a very slight majority against the Cambodian adventure.

This is quite—well, and Vietnam. I wouldn't restrict it to Cambodia. Cambodia was the occasion for the votes, but I think it reflects their views about the Vietnam adventure as a whole. They are realizing what it's doing to our country.

Now, when a majority makes that decision, I think it's significant. But there is very, very limited way to bring this to the attention of the American people.

And with the use of television you create what used to be called the "Cult of the Personality." And the whole dignity and fortunes of the great country of 200 million seems to be focused and is typified by this one individual, and he becomes a kind of revival of the old Gods of the medieval and ancient days.

And people—I get these letters, we get hundreds of them; stand behind the President, as if he was infallible.

And yet—especially in foreign relations. They don't do that with regard to domestic relations.

Take the overriding of the veto on Hill-Burton. But in foreign relations it's another matter. He represents the whole mystique of the nation in foreign affairs and it is a very difficult thing to present any contrary view without appearing to be well, disloyal.

Mr. KALB. Senator, perhaps in this connection, the Vice President of the United States is sharply critical of you, of Ambassadors Harriman and Vance and a number of other people—number of other Senators, in fact and you speak about the American society deteriorating at this point.

Do you link the two—this kind of attack with an overall fear that you have about the course of American life at this point?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I certainly do.

I think that the Vice President's attacks are a symptom of a malaise in this country that is very serious. It's a revival of something like occurred under—when Senator McCarthy from Wisconsin was in the Senate.

The difference is that this man speaks for the Administration which is the whole power of the nation and is a very dangerous—is a much more dangerous thing.

Senator McCarthy didn't have any power

to actually do anything to anybody other than talk about them and he could ruin their reputation but he couldn't—didn't have the actual power of the State behind him.

This man may have—at least he intimidates people. I don't think there's any doubt about he intimidates. He inspires other people to radical actions.

I think these outbursts of threats through letters and telephone messages is an outgrowth of this kind of a spirit.

Mr. HERMAN. You're speaking of threats against your life and the lives of other Senators?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well and others. I'm not the only one.

Mr. HERMAN. What happens when in your mind, Senator Fulbright, when the Vice President or anybody else speaks out and denounces Averell Harriman and Cyrus Vance, implies that they sold out for a pair of horses from Stalin and so forth.

Why does the United States Senate not speak out in some public way to—if you feel this way—to defend him?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Defend the Vice President.

Mr. HERMAN. No, No, sir. Mr. Harriman, Mr. Vance and so forth.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Oh, well many people have.

But they have, of course everyone has enough job to defend himself, I mean on programs such as this whenever the occasion is proper why I would. I think it's disgraceful for these people to be subjected to this kind of criticism by an upstart man who has no standing really in this country comparable to the men he is criticizing.

And he's not entitled to it. But what does one do about it?

It's the same way with Joe McCarthy. When we finally censured him, of course, in that case but being a member of the Senate and as I said, he didn't have the power and didn't represent the power that this man does.

This is a very dangerous development in my view of having a leading member of the Executive Branch take up this kind of action.

Mr. MACNEIL. Senator, I'd like to turn you back to the Senate's powers and the Congressional war powers.

President Nixon has said he does not rely on the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution to continue war in Viet Nam; that he instead depends on his Constitutional right and responsibility to protect American troops.

If that is so, since he also has the right to assign military troops, doesn't he under this theory have a general power to make war where he thinks it necessary?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, Mr. MacNeil, we don't accept this at all.

I mean this is a theory which I think is strictly against the Constitution and it is most unusual for a so-called strict constructionist to adopt this new idea that our Constitution is obsolete and the President has the inherent power to do as he pleases.

This is part, I think of the illusion that grows out of what I said the "Cult of the Personality" which is when he gets polls that say they support everything he does over the Congress and everything else—it gives people the illusion of grandeur and it's completely contrary to the Constitution.

Mr. HERMAN. Didn't you just approve—

Senator FULBRIGHT. This is very significant in my view.

Let me say one thing. This is significant. The effort of the Senate to re-establish a balance is what I said I took some pleasure in.

There's not many things these days that I think are very, very beneficial or encouraging but these votes are in that the Senate is re-establishing beginning with the commitments resolution and then these votes—is

re-establishing its traditional and constitutional role and I think it is of some significance that we do not accept the Presidential interpretation that as Commander-in-Chief he has all these powers.

Mr. HERMAN. But didn't you just approve an Amendment, actually as the Cooper Church Amendment was finally amended.

It says that nothing in this section shall be deemed to impugn the Constitutional power of the President, etc. etc.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well,—

Mr. HERMAN. According the exercise of that power where it may be necessary to protect the lives of United States troops anywhere.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, what does the next sentence say? It says it doesn't impugn the right of the Congress either.

That was an exercise in futility brought upon by the—the second Byrd Amendment—we defeated the first Byrd Amendment and it was an out and out straight vote.

We defeated it from 52 to 47 as I recall it and it was what I thought a significant vote.

But Senator Byrd is a very admirable Senator. Everyone—he has great personal allegiance and he was determined to have a Byrd Amendment and they got the Byrd Amendment on there that is simply a recitation of language which people can read into it—

I did everything I could to prevent it and defeat it but then we had on the happy circumstance of having put that in, you put in on top of it the same kind of language of the Congress so I think that both of them were meaningless.

Mr. HERMAN. Well, it simply seems to me that you are saying here that you do not accept this right of the President and yet the Senate simply accepted an Amendment—

Senator FULBRIGHT. No. No. What do you read into that? That language means—

Mr. HERMAN. He can protect the lives of American troops wherever they may be deployed in the world.

Senator FULBRIGHT. There's a big question of his right to deploy them in other places—wherever they be—wherever they are he does have a right to protect them.

He certainly isn't supposed to go off and leave them but that doesn't mean he has a right to declare war and to take them wherever he likes.

The Congress can control this if it will. It has—you see it did pass the Tonkin resolution; however wrong it was and however deceitful the President—that Administration was nevertheless it passed.

While I maintain it was obtained by fraud nevertheless it was obtained and there it stood as an authority or a purported authority by the Congress to conduct the war.

Mr. KALB. Senator?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. KALB. On another subject if we might—

Senator FULBRIGHT. I confess, Constitution is a little complicated for this kind of program. It takes forever—

Mr. KALB. The President and many high White House officials in the past week have expressed a new sense of alarm about a Russian military build up in the Middle East.

In fact the President said that he considered the Middle East more dangerous than Viet Nam.

Do you share the sense of alarm?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, yes, it's an explosive situation.

I don't think it's more dangerous than Viet Nam. There's nothing more dangerous to the future of our country than Viet Nam because of what it's doing here at home in my view.

But I think that the Russians—I am sure and other people, too, are becoming much more concerned about the course of events, the apparent neglect of SALT talks which so many people had hopes in.

Our refusal, as I understand it although this is all kept secret and nobody really knows what is going on—our refusal to come to any agreement for example on ABM where there were some tentative reports that I am not sure are correct that the Russians offered to abandon the ABM or not go forward with the ABM and we refused. In fact, we apparently have made no progress yet.

And I noticed the other night the President didn't mention any SALT talks at all in this hour long, I believe it was, along with three men—it's amazing that this which—this activity to which we attach so much significance only a few months ago now is apparently just forgotten and shelved on the back shelf.

All of this leads to a general apprehension, I think that the cold war is heating up and is getting more dangerous and I think in that sense the President is correct.

Mr. MACNEIL. Senator, do you think—do you believe the President when he states that he does in fact intend to end the Viet Nam war—to pull it down or are you of the school that believes he still wants to defeat the enemy?

Senator FULBRIGHT. This was brought up, as you know—we've noticed it before. It's very hard to bring this home. I don't question his sincerity.

As I remember in that famous football game between Texas and Arkansas, I never did think that the coach of Arkansas intended to lose that game. He wanted to win but he made the wrong call.

I think the President wants to win—he wants to have a very reputable and satisfactory settlement of the war.

I think he makes the wrong call. I think the means he's adopted called Vietnamization and invasion of Cambodia is absolutely the wrong way to go about to achieve his announced purposes and—

Mr. KALB. What's the right call?

Mr. MACNEIL. Senator, can you—

Senator FULBRIGHT. The right call, is the way as I've mentioned that the French did it when they were faced with a similar situation and they went to Geneva.

This is as near a signal, the right play to call that I can describe and it's very well known at least—those who've looked into it as how they did it.

Mr. HERMAN. Did you read anything into the President's call for negotiations. It was a very carefully balanced sentence—"in Paris or on all of Indo China"—one part of the sentence mentions a place and the other mentions all of Indochina and seems to imply a Geneva Conference.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well I think and other people have suggested a Geneva Conference and it would be—reconvene Geneva Conference—I mean many Senators and others from time to time have recommended it. I think even the President at some time has said that that might be acceptable but the Russians and British have not and particularly the Russians haven't been very enthusiastic about it—not wanting to I guess take the responsibility for it.

At least until the terms for—that would give some prospect for success have been agreed upon and such terms have never been approached, I don't think.

Mr. KALB. Senator, you mentioned before the possibility of heating up of the cold war.

I wonder what you really—what are you trying to get at there? The heating up of the cold war? Do you feel that the President on the one hand is talking about an effort to have an era of negotiations—not an era of confrontation. And it would seem to be at least on the face of it diametrically opposite what he intends.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, but I don't wish at any point to raise any question about his motives or his sincerity—it's only his judgment as to the means that he seeks to achieve the end that I raise questions about.

And I'm sure that he's as devoted to preserving the integrity of this country that I am or anybody else—it is the means that you choose and I think his means are very poorly adapted for that and so it isn't his intention.

I'm bound to say in his statements there creeps into it the idea of—that we are still on a crusade against Communism as an ideology.

Dean Rusk used to use this at times and it shifted on to a further obligation of a treaty nature and others of giving self-determination to South Viet Nam.

What does this all mean? It finally comes back, I think, to—that whether he admits it or not that he is determined that Communism, as such, shall not prevail in South Viet Nam under any circumstances even if it means the total destruction of this country apparently.

Mr. MACNEIL. Senator, what role do you think the United States should play in Asia? In Southeast Asia and all Asia? Something in the nature of what the British have been doing with East of Suez—a pull back?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Yes, we should be very friendly. We've had no previous experience there.

And it is very late in the game to start a colonial empire—I mean, that's out of place now and out of fashion.

The policy up until President Johnson or even Kennedy was not to become involved on the mainland of Asia—not to—

Mr. MACNEIL. Where would you draw the line?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, the most fashionable I think the best known is Walter Lipmann's—what does he call it—Blue Water?

That we have our bases in the Pacific. We have the largest Navy in the World and that's a big enough line. I mean maintain Hawaii and Guam—we have them. No one's talking about giving them up.

But really the idea that it's a vacuum there and unless we are there, the Russians are there, it doesn't appeal to me as a factual matter. This is an illusion developed or a theory developed by the colonial powers to justify their occupation of countries that have a longer history than we have.

These countries are quite able to manage their own affairs in my view without destruction such as we are wrecking now upon Cambodia.

I think it's a terrible thing to destroy these little countries with modern fire power and Napalm—it seems to me as inexcusable.

Mr. HERMAN. Senator, I hate to keep skipping around like this but I think we left part of the Middle Eastern question unanswered.

There has been a rash of stories saying that the Administration hopes to get Russian pilots actually flying planes out of Egypt by diplomatic action.

What do you think?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well I would hope we could.

Mr. HERMAN. You think it's possible?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I think that—I'm not sure you can solve these problems one by one or just without again having a little different attitude toward your overall problems.

One of the greatest disappointments to me is SALT talks. SALT was supposed to be central to this. This is the Arms race between the two super powers.

Now if you aren't really interested in this—this carries a meaning all around the world, doesn't it.

I'm not saying all should be solved at one time because it's too complicated to put them all in one package and solve them.

It's the attitude you have toward these problems and especially the attitude the Russians have toward us and vice versa.

Mr. HERMAN. Well, if the question of the Soviet pilots is going to be solved as a single

problem, what do we have to negotiate with? What pressures? What exchanges? What can we do to negotiate them out?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well, it's the danger, of course, of it becoming a conflagration.

I don't think that the Russians want to have a conflagration with us or a showdown or a nuclear war, if you like.

But I'm sure—what distresses me is that my own country is so reluctant, apparently, to make an agreement in the arms race.

You know what the Senate went through last year on the ABM.

This year we passed resolution 211, introduced, if you remember by Mr. Brooke and then amended which said no further deployment of offensive or defensive weapons.

It was 76 to six, or something like that and the Administration apparently pays no attention whatever to this.

It was intended to stop the deployment of MIRV if possible and other things to make it easier to approach agreements in SALT.

Nothing has happened. It is so relegated to the back burner that the President doesn't even mention it in an hour long broadcast.

Mr. KALB. Senator, in fairness, he wasn't really asked about it.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Well here were 3 of the most sophisticated men on television. Why didn't they ask him about it if they thought there was anything going on—

Mr. HERMAN. Well, let me turn it around.

Do you think that the lack of publicity means that nothing is happening at the SALT talks?

Senator FULBRIGHT. I think so.

They are very secretive about it and they won't say—

Mr. HERMAN. Couldn't that be a sign of progress?

Senator FULBRIGHT. And the other thing that bothers me is their insistence upon continuing with ABM. I mean the absolute negative attitude they take toward the Congress' effort in trying to cut back on some of these most extravagant programs.

Now, they veto a Bill like Hill-Burton but insist upon SSTs, upon ABMs, upon all these aircraft carriers and so on, indicating an attitude on their part that they really have no confidence whatever in arms control or even desire it.

Mr. KALB. Secretary Rogers said that there has been progress in the SALT talks and he said that he would look forward to some kind of agreement—he hopes comprehensive but perhaps within a year. He has said that.

Senator FULBRIGHT. Within a year—it's always a year or two years or three years. I mean I don't think you can wait this long with things moving as they are—our own economy—I don't want to bring it all up.

But you know such things as the Penn Central bankruptcy—the largest railroad organization in America. These are serious things going on here at home.

I didn't come here to—

Mr. KALB. You think the economic issue may be the dominant issue in the campaign this year?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Apparently you can't reason, so that may be the only thing.

As one of our witnesses said the other day if they won't listen to reason maybe a depression is the only thing that is going to bring us to our senses.

Mr. MACNEIL. Senator, back in the Middle East, do you think the United States has a commitment or should have a commitment to Israel—to its territorial integrity?

Senator FULBRIGHT. We have no formal commitment—no treaty or otherwise. The commitment is the tremendous respect that the people of this country have for the Israeli and the Jewish race in general and the tremendous number we have and some of the best citizens we have in this country as a practical matter, leaving out commitment is a bad word for that.

I mean, if you say, will we go to great

lengths to assist and protect Israel we will, but without any formal commitment.

That's in the nature of our country and the people who live in it and the respect that they have for the Israelis.

Mr. HERMAN. Senator, we have about 15 seconds left.

Now that the recall movement against you has failed in Arkansas, do you feel optimistic about your re-election?

Senator FULBRIGHT. Oh, that's too far off and that's 4 years off but the people—I've always felt there were very discriminating people in Arkansas.

Mr. HERMAN. And the time has discriminated against us.

Thank you very much for being with us here today on Face The Nation.

ANNOUNCER. Today, on Face the Nation, the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator J. William Fulbright, Democrat of Arkansas, was interviewed by CBS News Diplomatic Correspondent Marvin Kalb; Neil MacNeil, Chief Congressional Correspondent of Time Magazine; and CBS News Correspondent George Herman.

Next week, another prominent figure in the news will Face the Nation.

MILITARY AID TO GREECE STILL AN ISSUE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the vote on Monday, June 29, on my amendment to prohibit further military assistance to Greece reveals growing senatorial support for this position. When the issue was debated last December some Senators voted to sustain the Foreign Relations Committee without necessarily considering such a course to be desirable. On the other hand, several other Senators who voted to delete a similar provision last December have now actively joined those who believe that some gesture of U.S. disapproval of the practices of the present Greek regime is not only desirable, but necessary. As a July 1 editorial in the New York Times stated:

President Nixon will make a mistake if he interprets the Senate's narrow rejection of an arms embargo against Greece as a signal for a full-scale resumption of military aid to the Athens junta.

As the Times editorial suggests, the only possible reason for our present policy is the expanded Soviet presence in the eastern Mediterranean. I was conscious of this increased danger when I offered my amendment. I believe that our present policy adds to our vulnerability in the Mediterranean and threatens the effectiveness of NATO. As was stated by the Times editorial:

In its own interest the United States cannot ignore these expressions of outrage by its European friends and allies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial and an editorial from the Des Moines Register, supporting my amendment, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 1, 1970]

ARMS FOR THE COLONELS

President Nixon will make a mistake if he interprets the Senate's narrow rejection of an arms embargo against Greece as a signal for full-scale resumption of military aid to the Athens junta. Some Senators probably

voted against Senator Hartke's ban on arms sales only because they were unwilling to tie the President's hands on a security matter, not because they wanted to help entrench the Papadopoulos regime.

A case of sorts can be made for resuming the shipment of major military items to Greece, but unfortunately the Administration never puts it candidly. It has nothing to do with any value for NATO of the Greek armed forces, purged long ago for political reasons of nearly all their experienced officers.

The case is simply that this military hardware for the colonels may help preserve for the United States Navy and Air Force facilities in Greece needed to cope with an expanded Soviet presence in the Eastern Mediterranean.

Even this case is questionable, however, for it presumes that the colonels will remain in power. Although they have survived three years, Colonel Papadopoulos and his henchmen are not yet secure enough even to lift the state of siege and put their own authoritarian constitution fully into effect. Appeasing the colonels with military hardware now may actually imperil the future use of those air and naval facilities under a successor Government.

Another serious aspect of continued appeasement is that it pits the United States against a rising tide of hostility to the Athens regime in Western Europe. Greece quit the Council of Europe to avoid expulsion. A European Commission found the junta guilty of flagrant violations of the European Convention on Human Rights. The European Economic Community is reconsidering customs and tariff concessions granted to Greece "because of the repeated offenses against human and civic rights."

In its own interest the United States cannot ignore these expressions of outrage by its European friends and allies. The Administration must weigh them carefully against the presumed short-run advantages of large-scale military aid for the colonels and an eight-vote "victory" in the Senate against an arms embargo.

BAN ARMS SALES TO GREECE

The United States ought to have learned by now that often the major effect of selling or giving arms to dictators is to make it more difficult for their own people to get rid of them. But most dictators are generals, or perhaps colonels, and the Pentagon easily convinces itself that these officers are sound fellows and mighty bulwarks against Communism, and that American interest requires arming them.

There is a law on the books forbidding military guarantees or sales of arms to "military dictators" who "deny social progress to their own people." But that doesn't seem to stop arms sales. So the foreign military sales authorization bill now before the Senate adds a prohibition of arms sales to military dictators who "deny the growth of fundamental rights" to their own people.

This is pretty cloudy language, too, so Senator Vance Hartke (Dem., Ind.) is sponsoring a ban against arms sales to the present Greek government, which consists of a junta of colonels who seized power to prevent an election which they feared would elect a government they distrusted.

The colonels took off their uniforms and act as civilians now—but they suppress public criticism and jail and torture political opponents. They got Greece kicked out of the Council of Europe and criticized in the NATO foreign ministers council.

The United States did prohibit major arms sales (not small arms) to Greece after this coup, suspended the ban for a time after the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia and is reported to be planning to drop it now. (The Pentagon denies the report.)

The Senate won't get to the Hartke amendment until it completes action on the Cooper-Church amendment to the same bill, to restrict future U.S. military activities in Cambodia. Administration supporters are stalling with amendments and talk, so the Hartke amendment will have to wait.

Hartke is right. The Greek junta of colonels is more than strong enough already.

DR. GEORGE JAMES: THE STRUGGLE FOR HEALTH

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, Dr. George James, president of the Mount Sinai Medical Center of New York and dean of the Mount Sinai Medical School, delivered a major address to the Conference on Medicine and the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969.

In his address, Dr. James called for a substantial increase in preventive medicine activities by the Federal Government, and he suggested a number of ways in which cooperation among the concerned Federal agencies could be improved.

I share Dr. James' belief that an increase in preventive medicine is vital to the improvement of the health of the people of our Nation. Of course, curative medicine, long the major thrust of our Nation's health community, will continue to be important, but only by increasing our preventive efforts can we take the great strides we need to bring adequate health care to our citizens.

Mr. President, I believe that Dr. James' address will be of interest to all of us concerned with the quality of health care in America. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STRUGGLE FOR HEALTH

(By George James, M.D.)

It is a great pleasure to accept the invitation of the program committee, specifically that of Dr. Lorin Kerr, to be your banquet speaker this evening. In asking me to come Dr. Kerr indicated that you were not seeking an expert on the health of the coal miner or on the struggles which led up to the final passage of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. In this respect, Dr. Kerr certainly did his job successfully. This, therefore, has been a rare opportunity for me to learn a great deal about the problems of the health of the coal miner and the very fascinating story of the Health and Safety Act of 1969.

Last year at Consol No. 9 in West Virginia, a modern, "safe" mine, 78 coal miners were trapped and killed below ground in one of the most volcanic eruptions of explosion and fire in the memory of federal mine inspectors. At this "safe" mine, the daily methane emission was eight million cubic feet, enough to supply the heating and cooking needs of a small city if it were captured and sold.

In the 100 years that partial records of fatal mine accidents have been kept, more than 120,000 men have died violently in coal mines, an average of 100 every month for a century. This total does not include those who died of what passes for "natural causes" in work that is notoriously hazardous to health as it is to life and limb. The "natural" death rate of miners is eight times that of workers in any other major industrial occupation. The hazard of black lung, as the coal industry and physicians in its

employ constantly point out, is as yet a qualitatively and quantitatively uncertain threat to life. It was real enough, however, to cause over 30,000 West Virginia miners to engage in wildcat strikes to demand that the State Legislature include black lung in the list of injuries and diseases for which the disabled miners are eligible to collect workmen's compensation benefits.

Studies emanating from the Pneumococcal Research Unit of Cardiff, Wales, have convincingly established that coal dust, *per se*, is a source of injury to the lung. It is unbelievable that today when vast sums of money are spent on cardiac and lung transplants, hearings are still being held to determine whether it is necessary to protect the coal miners from coal dust. It is disturbing that, though the new Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 establishes what Congress considered "adequate standards" for the mines (and these "adequate" standards are the subject of much debate), the problem of enforcement and, therefore, prevention still has not been solved. Some coal miners are still being allowed to develop irreversible pulmonary disease although our knowledge of the art makes us fully capable of preventing anthracosis and anthracosilicosis.

The new Federal code of health and safety regulations for the nation's 150,000 coal miners was a historical achievement, but for many it was a little like the proverbial locking of the barn door. The record of death and injury in the coal mines has consistently been the worst of any major industry. While safety techniques have been recommended by engineers since the first terrible disasters in the 1870's, mine safety costs money, so the industry has preached the dictum that coal mining is dangerous business, and some deaths are inevitable. This, of course, need no longer be the case.

The new law imposes severe regulations on the industry. Inspections on the most gas-laden explosive mines will now occur once every five days instead of twice a year. The health and safety of the workers will, for the first time, come first. In this multi-million dollar reform the most expensive part will probably be the provision for reducing the contamination of mine air by microscopic coal dust—within 18 months—since this has recently been found to be the cause of the endemic "black lung".

Unfortunately, it usually takes a tragedy to bring about corrective measures, and in the case of the miners, it took a lifetime of tragedies. Now we must look ahead to see what can be done to prevent the loss of more lives. The true story of coal is not its statistics—tons and carloadings and days lost in strikes. The tale of the coal miner is as full of atrocities and evil personalities as a Charles Dickens novel. For behind the Appalachian coalfields, miners have been among the most systematically exploited and expendable classes in this country. The giant fans used to clear the air of methane are prey to weather conditions. The explosion in West Virginia last November occurred during what the United Mine Workers Journal calls the "explosion season." Every fall through 1967 the Journal had published warnings to their Union brothers to observe special precautions during the danger season. In this age when men walk on the moon, no effective research has yet been done on such meteorological coincidences which the industry terms "folklore".

Disaster prevention, in general, has been primitive to put it mildly. At every level of responsibility, from the individual miner to government groups, death and disease have been viewed with horror, yet dismissed with the rationalization that "mining is hazardous and people will die underground". As a result of the West Virginia disaster, mine inspections came to the fore and it is possi-

ble that we have at last begun prevention methods for disaster.

We are finally beginning to learn that occupational diseases can be controlled and, hopefully, done away with by improving the health and well-being of the worker and eventually that of his dependents. It is this belief that has prompted our Medical Schools and other health care agencies to lay new and special emphasis on the environmental health sciences. The health of the worker off the job must also become our responsibility. We must find ways and means to provide a high quality of medical care for him and his family.

Inaccessibility to the system is one of the major contributors to the "much-proclaimed health care crisis". Dr. Steinfeld recently told a group of industrial physicians. American industrial plans represent a "natural point of first contact" with the health care system for the employed population, and he called upon members of the Industrial Medical Association to design health care systems that involve the work place. A health center at the work place would have a very high potential for being used as the multipurpose primary care center for emphasizing health promotion and preventive medicine. There would be opportunities for using new health technologies and for the creation of new health careers for paraprofessionals. Developing such health care programs, Dr. Steinfeld said, would be to the best financial and professional interests of the private practitioner and occupational physician because such systems would function as stable referral and payments sources.

In the United States, increasing citizen demands for health care accompanied by sharply rising hospital costs, drug costs and physicians' fees have priced even marginal health care out of the reach of many citizens. Even the cost of health insurance itself has often exceeded the ability of people to afford it. As a result, labor leaders, doctors, Congressmen and even businessmen are all proposing health insurance plans of one sort or another. There will be no early solution.

There is no doubt that there is a real crisis in medical care in this country. The problem of the unequal distribution of medical care has become increasingly well known. Stories of large semi-urban and rural areas devoid of all local medical care are no longer startling. Communities which have taken the initiative to build office and treatment facilities in order to recruit a physician have seen these fine facilities go begging month after month. Many of our young physicians who have undertaken the task of meeting the physician service needs of such an area have had to leave when their wives insisted they would rather have a live husband who is making a less spectacular income than one whose years are limited because he is working himself to death. The government must seek to meet the rapidly increasing cost of medical care and at the same time satisfy a sharply rising citizen demand. The citizen with his increased sophistication, due largely to an unprecedented improvement in communication, now sees the large amounts of care which he is not receiving, and which he knows can be made available.

It is clear that the crisis is so great, its pace of increase so steep, that equality alone in modern medicine cannot be the answer even when coupled with top efficiency. Rather it is "quality" which we need so desperately, quality which provides a true yardstick of successful medical care—proof that the specific health problem has been solved. To an economist, a health program is good if it meets the public demand at reasonable cost. To a biologist, it is only good if it cures the disease. To an epidemiologist, it is at its best if it can prevent the onset of the disease in the first instance.

The best and least complex description of quality in health and medical care is the

ability of a program to control death, disability and the development of disease. Many non-physician services are involved—sanitation programs, food processors, housing programs, drug makers, social services, accident control devices and health educators. These measures often do more for the control of disease than can our trained physicians. When a seventh grade school teacher can motivate her school children not to begin smoking, she is over ten times more effective in the control of lung cancer than our finest chest surgeon, who at best, is able to cure only one in fifteen of his patients. Those who put fluorides into New York City's water supply do more for the control of dental caries than is within the power of that city's 8,000 dentists working beyond what they are already doing. And when a national act protects the health of a coal miner, this is better than the construction of a dozen hospitals. Admittedly, this is not what is usually meant when people speak of medical care. What people demand is not health but medical services when they feel ill, even though, for our major accidents and degenerative diseases of today, this may often mean very little in the way of real disease control.

History clearly indicates that a major disease has rarely been controlled until we have learned how to attack it before the occurrence of its symptoms. The finest quality of medical care is preventive medicine including early pre-symptomatic diagnosis (which was sadly lacking for the miners), and the most prompt therapy of the disease while it is in its early, most preventable and most curable form.

The availability of successful preventive medicine, of course, depends heavily upon research. You will recall that in the 1950's our country had suffered polio outbreaks which were devastating to young and old, and each year seemed to bring more polio patients, polio deaths, and respirator patients beyond any expectations. Respirator centers were being built at unbelievable expense and still there was not enough. Meanwhile, in a Harvard laboratory, a scientist sat working—using a minimum of funds available to him—and came up with an answer which virtually put an end to poliomyelitis; and measles and German Measles as well. Before Dr. George N. Papanicolaou's discovery, cancer of the uterine cervix was a leading cause of female cancer deaths. Largely because of what is known as the "Pap Test", named for its discoverer, cancer deaths in women which once numbered 28,000 per year, have dropped by 50% to less than 14,000. It has been said that if every adult woman had this painless, inexpensive examination once a year, the number of such deaths would approach zero.

In the matter of smoking, though it would seem that all too few have heeded the news media in their warnings, a national survey indicates that 1.4 million Americans quit cigarette smoking between August 1967 and August 1968. The National Center for Health Statistics figures that this now brings the total who have quit since June 1966 to 2.5 million.

At the present time the country is faced with an unbelievable phenomenon. With a total expenditure for health care of sixty-three billion dollars, only 1.5 billion has been allocated for biological research in health and disease under the programs of the National Institutes of Health; and even this small amount is now in danger. It is shortsighted to say that too much money is spent on research when the solutions to the crisis in medical care can only truly come from that direction. There are those who feel that the one and one-half billion for biological research is far too much. But it is a fact that if the entire sum were put back into the mainstream of medical care, there would be no visible effects; no advancement in the real control of deadly illnesses, no sure

surcease to the deepening crisis in medical care. Do you recall the era in our history when tuberculosis was the number one cause of death in the nation? Equality of care at that time meant the opportunity for the poor to have the purging, the blistering, and the bleeding which was the recommended and available treatment to the rich of that day. We are thankful that there were those willing to work toward the development of much more effective weapons. We are also fortunate that those who were devoted to equality in medicine in the old days did not prevent the continued search for quality.

As we await the research findings which will make it possible to improve quality, which is crucial in medical care, we must continue to press for increased efficiency in medicine. In addition to emphasis on prevention, we can do this through the use of engineering applied to medicine and through the use of more categories of allied health professional workers. It can be assumed that streamlining by the use of biomedical engineering and the development of more health workers of differing skills can present real hazards. They could, for example, lead to more malpractice problems, with the courts making the determination of what constitutes quality medical care. There is no doubt that a team effort is required: we need political scientists, economists, methods of reducing medical care costs and ways to rapidly train large numbers of health workers. But this should all be done in a way that exerts a steady pressure toward the improvement of the quality and effectiveness of the medical care itself. Among these techniques is the familiar NIH pattern of the best scientific peer review with selective funding of those projects deemed most productive, of highest quality and most capable of controlling disease. This NIH pattern is referable to quality in service programs. It is being utilized in the still rudimentary and financially starved Regional Medical Programs. With the exception of the coal miners, it is not yet being emphasized at all in programs of environmental health.

It is here that the well trained professional must teach, lead, and accept responsibility. Today institutions of higher education are beginning to respond to the environmental challenge, a major aspect of community health. In the major universities, there is a great impetus for the movement in both students and young faculty. This may be doing for science education in the 1970's what nuclear physics did in the 1950's. Those universities that have responded to the pressure to study the environment are finding that the study of ecology is a meeting ground for all the disciplines ranging from bio-medicine to the study of law. Of all the problems of pestilence, persecution, intolerance, inhumanity—only in the crises of ecology is man really faced with a challenge different from what he has ever faced before. These problems are becoming so acute, so intensive in their development, so irreversible, that we are running out of time, of space, and of resources with which to solve them. Vast problems of unbridled population growth, pollution, and depletion of natural resources cry out for solution while we yet have that small amount of time which remains. The effort must be comprehensive, long range, a true team effort with strong quality controls.

Although the National Science Foundation is augmenting funds to support some interdisciplinary study, the agency currently reflects the prevailing Federal grant policy. In recent years it has acted to lock university research into single-department programs, emphasizing short-range research geared to practical applications in terms of the mission of the funding agency. This leaves little room for innovation, or for hope of a real solution. Those Federal agencies

which are ecologically oriented are the very ones that lack a tradition of supporting the universities in research and development. An example of the difficulties resulting from all of this is in the experience of the University of Oklahoma. This institution has already put together a faculty pool for broad environmental studies, but was turned down this year in its request for a Science Foundation grant. Thus far, to the best of my knowledge, the University has found no alternative source of funds.

It has been said that modern man has asbestos in his lungs, DDT in his fat, and strontium 90 in his bones. In addition, he is living longer, and thereby runs a greater risk that these accumulations may become extensive and serious. At last, a new dawn of awareness and action has appeared, and scientists—men of medicine, ecology, biology, botany, and other related disciplines who, after years of seeing their warnings go unheeded, are being sought for help. Federal law has, for the first time, focused national attention on pollution of the working environment of a major industry in so clear a way that it becomes imperative that all major industries, and, eventually, all cities, improve the quality of their environments.

Citizens are now fighting pollution with legal, economic and legislative weapons. In one instance, a youth group pinpointed an air polluter by training a searchlight on the smoking stack of an industrial plant. The arousal of public opinion generally precedes any forward social step. The serious problem with human intelligence is, that in spite of all the lessons of history, it has difficulty in responding preventively, but responds only to crisis situations. And each of these crises is potentially more serious than the last. We are, indeed, running out of time.

The role of the health professional today is a frustrating one. Society has invested heavily in his training to give him great competence in his field. To him the matter of high quality of care has great relevance. Yet he sees around him a different demand, a different definition of relevance. If he turns away from the clamor, he soon finds himself outside of the mainstream of human endeavor. If he submits, he is blamed for the ineffectiveness of much of medicine as well as the rapidly increasing demands and costs of medical care.

In the case of preventive medicine, we follow a curious policy, i.e., a preventive medicine technique must be entirely proved before it is employed. We must not risk creating a demand for it if none yet exists, unless we are certain of its effectiveness. It goes without saying that, for our major degenerative diseases, this is a qualification which is rarely either met or capable of being met on the basis of evidence to be available within our lifetime. In symptomatic disease, however, we try a suggested therapy which has not yet been completely proved because it is all we have and the patients demand care. This is, indeed, a curious double-standard.

Our Medicaid and Medicare laws have been written so that a physician who wishes to be paid for anticipating clinical illness under these programs must use subterfuge. The "deductibles" provided in these measures further discourage the patient from seeking care until the symptoms have become unbearable because of pain or anxiety.

The health professional owes it to society not only to become technically competent in his field but to remain so. The professional must be diligent in remaining abreast of major new developments in his field, and society should demand periodic proofs of competence by a review before one's peers instead of before the tribunals of the malpractice courts. Deans of medical schools are now urgently requested to change the standards for admission to medical school so as to accept individuals from less fortunate socioeconomic backgrounds. Though we learn to

use a different yardstick to measure excellence for this deprived group, the accent must always remain on excellence.

There is no doubt that the field of community medicine is now among the most socially relevant branches of medicine. The attempt to reach its objective, i.e., to reduce the unmet health needs in the communities, is the pursuit of one of the highest social goals. Its broad reliance is upon results rather than activity. Community Medicine employs every useful technique, be it medical, nonmedical, social, economic or political. As health leaders we must accept the role of leadership and not be content with things "as they are". We share the responsibility with many others, but by virtue of our specialized training and experience we must attempt to gear government programs toward whatever we can do to exert pressures toward quality, insure prevention of disease and strive in the direction of what we hope can become the ultimate solution to our nation's unmet health needs.

Truly, we have not yet begun to scratch the surface of our potential in the use of known preventives, let alone given adequate priority to research efforts to find new ones. The similarity between the health problems of the rural wasteland and those of the urban ghetto dweller are striking and significant. Even middle class America shares this growing crisis in medical care. With the rising cost of medical care and the increase in demands, it is impossible to consider meeting the insatiable need through the use of the traditional methods of medical care. Medicare and Medicaid propose no changes in the structure of care, no change in the neglect of prevention, no change in the traditional physician-patient relationship, no change in the old fee-for-service arrangement. We must come up with new ideas, new techniques—and most of all—new knowledge.

What is needed, therefore, in this nation is a vast new effort to focus on unmet health needs. All groups of consumers and professional health workers alike must focus on this great mission. If the answers are disappointing to the particular desires of one professional group, then so be it. Perhaps our greatest health advances derive from non-medical ecological changes such as an improved environment and standard of living. The coal miner's Act does, indeed, touch all of the bases.

Under the programs established in the new Coal Mine Health and Safety Act by the Department of Interior, we find a set of regulations for guidance, a sensitivity to the control of health problems, a sense that the Federal government feels a responsibility for health problems, and a new spirit of health leadership. Here we find, too, a dedication to the importance of research, which dedication at times even surpasses that which we have come to expect from the programs supervised by our Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 is indeed a truly remarkable document. In it, the Federal government assumes a major responsibility for the health of the coal miners far beyond that which it accepts in relation to any other group of our citizens in the United States. This is an example of comprehensive Federal leadership involving several departments such as Commerce, HEW, Interior, National Science Foundation, and even the office of Science and Technology. The bill provides for a multi-faceted and pluralistic approach in order to create the greatest expertise in an important health problem, instead of the familiar and inadequate system of insisting on a single governmental agency in order to create leadership and fix responsibility. It is a far superior plan to involve the several departments concerned with the problem and insist that they work cooperatively in setting standards, holding public hearings, and in the develop-

ment of adequate research to find real answers to the pertinent health and safety problems.

I am particularly delighted by the great emphasis on research and the bringing into cooperative relationships of the office of Science and Technology and the National Institutes of Health. In fact, many parts of the miners' Act—such as the Secretary's ability to establish interim standards, indicate clearly the great importance that Congress attaches to utilizing the best available knowledge in the quickest possible time. It would indeed be a sign of real progress if this Act could serve as a model to inspire similar arrangements for these scientific agencies to look into the quality of Medicare and Medicaid, so that these vast programs might eventually be rendered capable of meeting the health needs of our population. Why must Medicare and Medicaid be the concern primarily of the Social Security Agency whereas its real problems, especially its need to provide pressures toward the steady improvement in the effectiveness of medical care, really fall under the aegis of the National Institutes of Health and National Center for Health Services and Development? These latter agencies could be more capable of dealing with the quality of care given under Medicare and Medicaid which, at the present time, seem responsible only for grinding out vast quantities of unevaluated medical care.

It is true that the health and safety of the miner is a highly visible entity and also represents a relatively finite problem. There are just so many mines and miners, and one can pretty well predict the amount of money which must be allocated in order to meet the problems and programs for such a group. Yet, can we not learn from our highly visible groups some valuable lessons on how to attack the equally severe problems of our silent but needy majorities?

Providing medical care for the untold millions who now go without it, and developing the required new knowledge of medical care as well as improving the efficiency of existing medical programs are problems of tremendous scope. Their exploration could devour indeterminate huge sums of money. This leads to a tendency to veer off, to avoid solid planning in these areas and to take refuge in a mixture of pluralistic programs, each aimed at meeting some particular demand of some particular highly visible group. We perhaps should not deplore this pluralistic approach because it is through such a system that we have the particular Mine Health and Safety Act with which we are so pleased. We need pluralistic efforts; we need these specific examples of true government leadership. But it is tempting to speculate from such instances and ask ourselves why, if we are so concerned about what happens to the miners 500 ft. underground, are we not also concerned about them at sea level? If we are concerned about the coal dust he breathes into his lungs while in the mine, why do we not equally deplore the illnesses of his family and the air pollution of his community which may impair his use as a worker, disturb his mental outlook, and greatly influence his entire career as a miner?

Colonel Aldrin, on his return from the moon, implied in his press conference that we should use the same long range processes and planning that got us to the moon in solving other serious problems. Whether or not he was thinking of it specifically, his remarks are particularly pertinent to medical care. Certainly the crisis of medical care deserves our immediate attention, our persistent and untiring dedication, the creation of a set of long range plans and their methodical development.

A government which has shown the ability to develop a comprehensive approach to the total health and safety of the coal miners can certainly take on the challenge to attack the severely neglected health problems of the urban ghetto and rural Appalachia. With

a country so rich in available resources and our national capitol so well endowed with a number of capable agencies, why cannot the Federal government involve them all cooperatively? Though its leadership for both centralized and decentralized programs, why can it not pool the great resources of the nation and develop standards for the evaluation of the quality, effectiveness and efficiency that could lead eventually to major definitive health programs for all of our local citizens?

There is, of course, one major difference between attempting to improve the health of our nation and protecting the health and safety of the coal miner. While one set of standards might work for all coal miners, it is inconceivable that one single detailed health plan could work for all the rest of us. But why do we not accept the fact that a particular program can work for the coal miners while an entirely different plan would operate for the asbestos worker or for the population of East Harlem in New York City, or for that of the Appalachians of Eastern Kentucky? Could we not, through Federal leadership and through the participation of responsible local officials qualified in the field of health and medical care, devise a pluralistic approach to solve our medical problems wherever they appear by whatever reasonable means it takes to solve them?

Perhaps some day when we, or more likely when our grandchildren look back upon this era, they will be able to consider the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 as the first of a series of models, each capable of solving a highly unique situation. Let us hope this Act will, indeed, be followed by many other programs equally effective in solving the health care problems of other population groups.

The importance of the Coal Mine Health and Safety Act is not only that it is Federal and involves many Federal agencies, not only that it commits the most sophisticated of our experts, not only that it is so comprehensive in its approach; its greatest importance lies in the fact that it is a health program which is geared to solve the particular problem with which it is concerned, rather than merely to provide for a continuation of traditional efforts in that area. It does not speak of providing doctors, but of the services they must give. It does not ramble generally about the health of the worker; it speaks of the specific quality of the air he breathes. As well as the systematic tests he must undergo. How this emphasis and great reliance on performance standards differs from nearly all of our major health service programs, very especially Medicaid and Medicare! We will not solve the crisis in medical care by dissipating our resources in highly popular but woefully unevaluated and unvaluated efforts. We must eventually husband our resources by accentuating that which is effective. The Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act suggests that this can be done.

I am told it is unique in the annals of health conferences to have one so well attended by experts which deals solely with the health of one group. Yet, we have had longer meetings dealing with the chemistry of a few specific molecules. Both such meetings are held for the same reason. We realize that our study of such specific problems and the resultant solutions have enormous generic value toward the eventual resolution of still greater and even more crucial issues. The fascinating and partially successful story of the health of the coal miner is a saga which is worth telling, worth studying and well worth copying. The final pages have not yet been written, and a great deal more remains to be done. But this would indeed be a fortunate nation if even a small fraction of the dedication and approaches, the same overwhelming concern were available and expressed on behalf of the health and safety of our other citizens. In this effort, it is my

belief that the present conference should prove enormously beneficial.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Medical Tribune and Medical News; pub. by Med. Tribune, Inc.; 4/3/69 Issue.
2. U.S. Medicine; Vol. 6, No. 9; 5/1/70 Issue.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 963, H.R. 17548, the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriations, 1971.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (H.R. 17548) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill for 1971, H.R. 17548, as reported, totals \$17,919,603,500 in new obligatory authority, which is \$1,024,015,700 over the appropriations for 1970, \$451,380,000 over the revised estimates for 1971, and \$529,391,200 over the House bill.

In addition, the bill includes contract authority to make grants, as follows:

College housing-----	\$9,300,000
Section 235, homeownership-----	130,000,000
Section 236, rental assistance-----	135,000,000
Rent supplement-----	75,000,000

The bill also funds three budget amendments sent to the Senate and not considered by the House, as follows:

Federal Home Loan Bank Board: Interest adjustment payments, as a result of the authorization that was passed by the Senate not long ago--	\$250,000,000
Office of Emergency Preparedness: Policy direction of oil import program-----	600,000
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality-----	800,000

The largest amount included in the bill for one agency is \$9,085,528,000 for the Veterans' Administration, of which \$5,456,600,000 is for compensation and pensions of veterans and \$1,857,200,000 is for their medical care.

The next largest amount is \$3,321,871,000 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, of which \$1,300,000,000 is for urban renewal, \$575,000,000 is for model cities, and \$645,500,000 is for low-rent public housing annual contributions.

Next is National Aeronautics and Space Administration, at \$3,319,303,000, then General Services Administration at \$712,229,500, and National Science Foundation at \$511,000,000.

That is the substance of the bill. It contains many other items.

This is my second year as chairman of this subcommittee. The Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), who is my counterpart and the ranking Republican on the subcommittee, and a dear friend and colleague, who is very cooperative, is serving his 12th year. Mr. Cooper, who is the clerk of the subcommittee, has served on this bill for 22 years of his 27 years with the committee. I want to say at this juncture that Mr. Cooper is going to retire at the end of this month, and I think the members of the committee, the entire Senate, and the people of this country owe him a great debt of gratitude.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. PASTORE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I simply want to say "Amen" to the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island about Mr. Cooper, who has been the clerk of this committee ever since I have been on it, which goes back to 1959. I think the committee took formal action the other day expressing their gratitude. I know we all feel that way.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator. The Senator is very gracious, and that is typical of him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded as original text for the purpose of amendment, that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 22, after the word "expenses", strike out "\$45,800,000" and insert "\$47,800,000".

On page 6, line 3, after "5 U.S.C. §109", strike out "\$24,725,000" and insert "\$24,900,000".

On page 6, line 12, after the word "expenses", strike out "\$18,210,000" and insert "\$18,350,000".

On page 7, line 11, after the word "moving", strike out "\$335,250,000" and insert "\$344,153,000".

On page 8, line 23, after the word "buildings", strike out "\$142,024,300" and insert "\$119,756,500"; on page 9, line 6, after the word "of", strike out "\$48,473,200" and insert "\$71,428,600"; in line 7, after the word "at", strike out "Augusta, Georgia, Honolulu, Hawaii, Indianapolis, Indiana, Houma, Louisiana, Albany, New York, Providence, Rhode Island, Denton, Texas, and Seattle, Washington," and insert "Honolulu, Hawaii, Indianapolis, Indiana, Frankfort, Kentucky, Fitchburg, Massachusetts, Albany, New York, Bronx, New York, Denton, Texas, and San Antonio, Texas,"; and, in line 13, after

the word "the", strike out "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1964, and 1967, and the Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriation Act, 1968," and insert "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1967, and the Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development Appropriation Acts of 1968 and 1970".

On page 10, after line 13, insert:

"Post Office and Federal office building, Augusta, Georgia, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$2,694,000;"

On page 10, after line 15, strike out:

"Courthouse and Federal office building, Alton, Illinois \$1,500,000;"

On page 10, after line 20, strike out:

"Courthouse and Federal office building, Frankfort, Kentucky, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$850,000;"

On page 10, after line 23, insert:

"Post Office and Federal office building, Houma, Louisiana, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$2,064,000;"

On page 11, after line 10, strike out:

"Charles A. Buckley Post Office and Federal office building, Bronx, New York, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$3,076,000;"

On page 11, after line 18, insert:

"Post Office and Federal office building, Providence, Rhode Island, in addition to the sum heretofore appropriated, \$1,355,600;"

On page 12, line 23, after the word "furnishings", strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,463,000".

On page 15, line 22, after the word "Administration", strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,215,000".

On page 20, line 11, after the word "Administration", strike out "\$2,500,000,000" and insert "\$2,606,100,000".

On page 20, line 17, after the word "laws", strike out "\$18,275,000" and insert "\$34,478,000".

On page 21, line 4, after "\$678,725,000", insert a comma and "of which \$10,000,000 shall be available only for use at the Mississippi Test Facility/Slidell Computer Complex and at other NASA facilities which can accommodate earth environmental studies to furnish, on a nonreimbursable basis, basic institutional and technical services to Federal agencies, resident at the complexes, in pursuit of space and environmental missions:"

On page 23, line 2, after the word "services," strike out "\$495,000,000" and insert "\$511,000,000"; and, in line 6, after the word "institutes", insert "and other programs of supplementary training".

On page 24, line 11, after "5 U.S.C. 3109", strike out "\$4,110,000" and insert "\$4,235,000".

On page 24, line 16, after "\$21,716,000", insert a comma and "including necessary funds to complete the Institutional Investors Study".

On page 26, line 24, after "(38 U.S.C. 641)", strike out "\$1,777,200,000" and insert "\$1,857,200,000".

On page 27, at the beginning of line 24, strike out "\$1,000" and insert "\$2,000".

On page 28, line 14, after the word "administration", strike out "\$59,000,000" and insert "\$79,000,000".

On page 31, after line 5, strike out:

"COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary for the Council on Environmental Quality, in carrying out its functions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190), including partial support of the Environmental Quality Council and the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, \$650,000."

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

"COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND
OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses necessary for the Council on Environmental Quality and the Office of Environmental Quality, in carrying out their functions under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (Public Law 91-190) and the National Environmental Improvement Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-224), including hire of passenger vehicles, and support of the Cabinet Committee on the Environment and the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality established by Executive Order 11472 of May 29, 1969, as amended by Executive Order 11514 of March 5, 1970, \$1,500,000."

On page 32, line 7, after "5 U.S.C. 3109", strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$560,000".

On page 32, line 17, after the word "planning", strike out "\$5,290,000" and insert "\$5,890,000".

On page 32, line 22 after "5 U.S.C. 3109", strike out "\$1,795,000" and insert "\$3,300,000".

On page 33, line 12, after "5 U.S.C. 3109", strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$2,175,000".

On page 33, line 20, after the word "expanded", strike out "\$291,500,000" and insert "\$295,500,000".

On page 34, line 19, after the word "law", strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$51,000,000".

On page 36, line 4, after the word "services", strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert "\$3,755,000".

On page 36, line 19, after "(42 U.S.C. 1452a)", strike out "\$1,000,000,000" and insert "\$1,300,000,000".

On page 37, after line 10, insert:

"GRANTS FOR TENANT SERVICES

"For contracts for grants and for grants to public housing agencies, for tenant services, as authorized by Section 204 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 1415), \$5,000,000 to remain available until expended."

On page 37, line 24, after the word "by", strike out "\$7,200,000" and insert "\$9,300,000".

On page 38, line 5, strike out "\$41,000,000" and insert "\$45,000,000".

On page 39, at the beginning of line 13, strike out "\$500,000,000" and insert "\$200,000,000".

On page 39, line 18, strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$8,700,000".

On page 40, line 22, after "1968", strike out "\$30,000,000" and insert "\$55,000,000".

On page 41, line 18, after the word "by", strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$75,000,000".

On page 42, line 13, after the word "and", where it appears the first time, strike out "section" and insert "sections 102 and"; at the beginning of line 15, insert "485"; and, in the same line, after the word "for", strike out "\$3,500,000" and insert "\$6,290,000".

On page 43, line 6, after "(34 Fed. Reg. 12985)", strike out "\$7,000,000" and insert "\$11,300,000".

On page 43, line 17, after the word "Department", strike out "\$13,500,000" and insert "\$14,500,000".

On page 44, line 19, after the word "of", strike out "\$5,750,000" and insert "\$6,625,000".

At the top of page 47, insert:

"FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

"INTEREST ADJUSTMENT PAYMENTS

"For payments to Federal Home Loan Banks for the purpose of adjusting the effective interest rates charged by such banks, as authorized by section 101 of the Emergency Home Finance Act of 1970, \$250,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only

upon the enactment into law of S. 3685, 91st Congress, or similar legislation."

On page 50, line 1, after the word "exceed", strike out "\$112,000,000" and insert "\$125,550,000".

On page 55, after line 10, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 512. No part of any appropriations contained in this Act shall be available for the procurement of or for the payment of the salary of any person engaged in the procurement of any hand or measuring tool(s) not produced in the United States or its possessions except to the extent that the Administrator of the General Services Administration or his designee shall determine that a satisfactory quality and sufficient quantity of hand or measuring tools produced in the United States or its possessions cannot be procured as and when needed from sources in the United States and its possessions or except in accordance with procedures prescribed by section 6-104.4(b) of Armed Services Procurement Regulation dated January 1, 1969, as such regulation existed on June 15, 1970."

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the committee has three amendments of a technical nature which were inadvertently omitted from the bill, and which do not change the appropriation amounts in the bill, as follows:

Page 22, line 22, strike out "\$19,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,500,000".

This amendment raises to the budget estimate the limitation on program development and management expenses of the National Science Foundation.

The reason for this is the cut made by the House of \$16 million. When the Senate restored the House cut, it is only logical to increase the expense limitation to budget estimate.

Page 25, line 3, after the word "only" insert "not to exceed \$4,000 for official reception and representation expenses".

The committee is advised that the Director of the Selective Service System and his staff have been paying for such expenses personally at regional conferences and other meetings.

Page 40, line 24, strike out "\$940,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,700,000".

This amendment raises to the budget estimate the limitation on administrative expenses for Urban Research and Technology in the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The restoration is correctly stated in the report.

Mr. President, I send these amendments to the desk and ask that they be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUGHES). Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUGHES). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I want to commend the chairman of our subcommittee, Senator PASTORE, for the excellent

and hard work he has put in on this bill during the lengthy hearings and committee considerations of the many, many items in the bill. As has always been the case, he has been most cooperative with me and I want him to know how much I enjoy working with him.

Mr. President, I will not go into detail now on the items in this bill. Chairman PASTORE has covered this well and there will be several amendments offered at which time I expect there will be extended discussion.

For NASA the committee has recommended an appropriation of \$3,319,303,000, which is \$91,575,000 under the authorization approved by the Space Committees of the House and Senate. We have come a long way down in our space expenditures. In fiscal year 1966 the NASA budget was \$5.932 billion. So this year we are talking about a \$2.613 billion under that budget of 4 years ago. Partly this is because the most significant hardware has now been purchased for our Apollo flights; partly this is because through these few years this country has felt increasing pressure to reorder its priorities and to hone down space expenditures wherever possible. In 1966 there were 420,000 Americans working on NASA-funded projects and now there will be less than 144,000 Americans working on NASA-funded projects.

Some might argue that we should simply stop the space program. I will not expand on this subject here except to say that any serious cut below the figures reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations may very well be tantamount to stopping the most significant parts of our space program. The NASA figures we will consider today have been cut, and cut, and cut from the time that the great experts in the space field first presented their budgets within the various divisions of NASA through the cutting process of the Bureau of the Budget and the Administration and then the Space Committees of the Congress. It may be that in the end Senators will have to ask themselves just one simple question: Are they for continuing the U.S. effort in space or do they wish to stop it now?

To go on to another item in the bill, we have all heard a great deal about the Veterans' Administration medical care programs. The Subcommittee on Independent Offices has taken extended testimony, first from the Veterans' Administration, then from outside witnesses, and from the junior Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), and then again after that from the Veterans' Administration. Much has been said and written on the subject of the level of care which this government is providing for its veterans. I do not think anyone in this Chamber wishes to cut down or lower the standards below what is absolutely "the best" for all our veterans. Through the years this committee has often recommended funds above budget estimates for medical research and this has paid off. Through the years this committee has always recommended the budget figure for medical care and I believe that this has paid off. This year the figure recommended by the committee is \$105 million over the amended budget esti-

mate. After initial submission of the budget, the Administration submitted an amendment increasing it by \$50 million. One set of figures may put this in context. For fiscal year 1970 the appropriation was \$1,655,201,000 for Veterans' Administration medical care. The committee recommendation this year—\$1,857,200,000 for medical care—is an increase of \$201,999,000. Of course, the costs of medical care continue to rise. But, more importantly, I am confident, and I know the chairman is confident that this recommended appropriation provides completely adequate funding for the best possible medical care of our veterans.

A small item in expense, but an important item is the committee's recommendation for the full funding of \$560,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Council. The House had cut this figure to \$400,000, and there is some thought that testimony in the House had confused them as to the transfer of certain personnel to the office of the Vice President. The \$560,000 is to fund 21 positions for the National Aeronautics and Space Council which under statute advises the Vice President and also advises the President on space and aeronautics priorities, across the board. Properly manned, these few experts can contribute tremendous benefits way beyond their cost in studying and assessing the recommendations of government departments in the space and aeronautics field.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Independent Offices has taken extended testimony from both HUD officials and from interested groups and persons across the country, and the chairman and I have met directly with various HUD officials in the study of the budget proposals for fiscal year 1971. I am pleased that the committee voted the full budget estimate of \$55 million for the line item "urban research and technology." The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development has given this item first priority in his budget presentation. We all know the pressures working against development of new and superior housing in this country. We must have technological breakthroughs and we must have a reorientation of the process of building housing in this country. The pressures of the ever-increasing costs of labor and the costs of materials and the extremely high cost and unavailability of money must be met and turned back. "Operation Breakthrough" and other research projects must be funded and fully funded in the hope that we can move ahead in developing the capacity for building adequate housing in this country.

I know there will be a move to increase the amount recommended for urban renewal. The committee has recommended \$300 million more than the budget estimate of \$1 billion. I will not develop this subject further here except to remark that since urban renewal started in 1949 we have spent or obligated \$9,015,500,000 of Federal funds on urban renewal programs.

I know that there will be a move to increase the committee recommendation for funds for grants for basic water and sewer facilities. I am for this program and I have before this year recommended

increases over the budget requests. This year the committee has recommended \$200 million, which is \$50 million over the budget request, but \$300 million under the House figure.

Senators will notice some report language on page 20 referring to section 508 of the bill. This is the same language as we had in the bill last year, and I am pleased to report that Government contracting under this language—which relates to research—has achieved a more fair sharing of costs of research with non-Government institutions. The report language makes clear that in those special instances where a small research organization's proposal leads to a contract wherein there is no tangible benefit to the organization, we should not expect cost sharing from that organization.

Mr. President, that is all I wish to say now about this bill. Again, I wish to thank the chairman (Mr. PASTORE) for his cooperation and courtesy in the handling of this most difficult appropriation bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado. He has been very cooperative. Frankly, I have never worked with a Member of the Senate under more pleasing and pleasurable circumstances than when I worked with the Senator from Colorado. We do not always agree. But we are never disagreeable in our disagreements.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have a statement that has been handed to me by a staff member of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), who could not be here today to read it himself.

The statement by Senator AIKEN reads as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR AIKEN

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have always believed that first things come first.

In this case we should not spare any efforts in making sure that our Veterans who are laid up in the 166 VA Hospitals throughout the Nation get the best medical care they need and deserve.

Toward that end I would urge the Senate to adopt the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee and increase funding for the VA by an additional \$100 million.

This would provide a total VA appropriation of just over \$9 billion, for an increase of \$646,518,000 over Fiscal 1970.

I would further urge that Senate conferees insist on the additional money for our Veterans when this matter is considered by a Conference Committee.

We should not forget for one moment that proper care for our Veterans is just another cost of war—although for many this is a hidden cost.

It is for that reason that we should take care of our injured veterans and provide benefits for their families and then redouble our efforts in trying to bring the war in Indo-China to an end which is only creating more injured Veterans, more widows and more orphans.

By adding this additional money for our VA Hospitals the Senate will be bringing to attention of the country once again the necessity for bringing this war to an early end.

We will also be giving some of our injured veterans hope that American people are not forgetting them or their families in this special time of need.

I would also like to call attention to the Senate that this Appropriations bill contains \$5.3 million for modernizing the Veterans Center in White River Junction, Vermont.

This is a project which I have been urging since 1967 after I visited the White River facility and found conditions in need of much repair.

I might add here that the Senior Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. Pastore, has been most helpful to our Vermont Veterans in getting this project approved.

Also, Congressmen Olin Teague and Joe Evins have been most considerate and sympathetic of the problems of the Vermont Veterans and have helped to make the White River project a reality.

The Junior Senator from California, Mr. Cranston, should also be commended for his leadership in working for improvements for our VA hospitals.

The Senate will be serving the Nation well if this additional \$100 million is added to the VA budget and I would hope this money is spent by the Administration in areas where it will do the most good.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for yielding. I am deeply grateful to him for his cooperation with the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and also with me.

Mr. President, I rise to speak about appropriations for the VA hospital and medical program contained in H.R. 17548, the independent offices of appropriations bill, as reported to the Senate by the Appropriations Committee.

Almost 7 months ago—on Veterans Day last year—I rose to speak on this same matter in the bill, for fiscal year 1970, and at that time offered an amendment to increase the appropriation by \$50 million.

After a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, my colleague from Rhode Island, I withdrew that amendment at his suggestion in order that the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, which I am privileged to chair, could launch a full investigation of medical care for Vietnam veterans in VA hospitals.

At that time Senator PASTORE said:

We should go into it in depth and find out exactly what the problem is, what needs to be done, and then do it and do it immediately.

Since that time, with enthusiastic participation and cooperation from the ranking majority member, the great chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee (Mr. YARBOROUGH), and its able ranking minority member, my fellow junior colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), our Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee has conducted an extensive and intensive oversight investigation—with 7 days of hearings from November 21, 1969, to April 28, 1970.

We received testimony from 45 witnesses, including some of the most eminent deans of medical schools and medical experts in the United States, from seriously disabled veterans themselves and from the rehabilitation experts of the various veterans' organizations.

In addition, as part of our investigation, I and the subcommittee staff visited a number of VA hospitals, talking with patients, administrators, physicians, nurses, and other personnel there.

Mr. President, in order to illustrate the breadth of our hearings, I ask unanimous consent, that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the witness list from those hearings.

There being no objection, the list of witnesses was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, at follows:

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1969

Johnson, Donald E., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, accompanied by Dr. H. Martin Engle, Chief Medical Director, Department of Medicine and Surgery; Dr. Chase, Assistant Chief Medical Director for Professional Services; John Peters, Director of Program Planning and Budgeting Services; D. C. Knapp, Acting General Counsel; J. H. Kerby and A. T. Bronaugh, Assistant General Counsels; John Shytle, Controller; Dr. Thomas C. Chalmers, Assistant Chief Medical Director for Research and Education; Dr. Paul Haber, Director, Extended Care Service; Daniel Rosen, Acting Director, Management Control Staff; Dr. Turner Camp, Regional Medical Director No. 2; Dr. Howard W. Kenney, Regional Medical Director No. 1; Dr. Harold Birnbaum, Deputy Regional Medical Director No. 5; Dr. Thomas J. Fitzgerald, Regional Medical Director No. 4; Dr. Oliver J. Harris, Regional Medical Director No. 3; Whitney Ashbridge, Office of the Administrator; L. A. Townsend, Deputy Director for Program Administration, Compensation, and Pension Service, DVB; and other Veterans' Administration officials.

Egeberg, Dr. Roger O., Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Lieberman, Dr. E. James, Consultant, National Institute of Mental Health testifying as a private citizen.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1969

Jennings, Lt. Gen. Hal B., Jr., the Surgeon General, Department of the Army; Brig. Gen. Thomas J. Whelan, Jr., Special Assistant to the Surgeon General for Medical Corps Affairs, Department of the Army; Brig. Gen. George J. Hayes, Director of Staff for Health Affairs; and Vernon McKenzie, Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, Department of Defense.

Rhodes, Fred, Deputy Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; Dr. John D. Chase, Assistant Chief Medical Director for Professional Services; John Peters, Director of Program Planning and Budgeting Service; A. T. Bronaugh, Assistant General Counsel; D. C. Knapp, Assistant General Counsel; John Kerby, Assistant General Counsel; John Shytle, Controller; Dr. Thomas C. Chalmers, Assistant Chief Medical Director for Research and Education; Dr. Paul Haber, Director, Extended Care Service; L. A. Townsend, Deputy Director, Compensation, Pension, and Education Service; Dr. Cecil Peck, Chief Psychological Service; Dr. Harold Schoolman, Director, Education Service; and David Wall, Deputy Regional Medical Director, Veterans' Administration.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1969

Lee, Russel V. A., M.D., founder and consultant, Palo Alto Medical Clinic, and clinical professor of medicine emeritus, Stanford University.

Lee, Dr. Philip, former Assistant Secretary for Health, Education, and Welfare, and chancellor, University of California Medical Center, San Francisco, Calif.

Luckey, Dr. Hugh, president, New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center, and vice president for medical affairs, Cornell University.

West, Dr. Louis Jolyon, professor and chairman of the Department of Psychiatry and Medical Director, Neuropsychiatric Institute, University of California at Los Angeles.

Wolf, Dr. Stewart, regents' professor of medicine, University of Oklahoma School of Medicine, and head of Neurosciences Section, Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Gonda, Dr. Thomas A., professor of psychiatry, associate dean, Stanford University Medical School, and director of the Stanford University Hospital, Stanford, Calif.

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1969

Mattingly, Charles E., assistant legislative director, the American Legion, accompanied by Edward H. Golembieski, director, Rehabilitation Commission, the American Legion; and I. B. Brick, M.D., senior medical consultant, National Rehabilitation Commission, the American Legion, and professor of medicine and chief of the Division of Gastroenterology, Georgetown Hospital.

Golembieski, Edward H., director, National Rehabilitation Commission, the American Legion.

Brick, I. B., senior medical consultant, National Rehabilitation Commission, the American Legion, and professor of medicine and chief of the Division of Gastroenterology, Georgetown Hospital.

Lassen, Peter L., executive director, Paralyzed Veterans of America, accompanied by Max Cleveland, a former officer in the 1st Air Cavalry in Vietnam.

Mead, Sedgwick, M.D., chief of physical medicine and neurology, Kaiser Foundation Hospital, Vallejo, Calif.

Huber, Charles, national director of legislation, William Flaherty, assistant national director of legislation, and Raymond P. Neal, national commander, Disabled American Veterans.

Klein, Dr. Donald C., coordinator for community affairs, National Training Laboratories for Applied Behavioral Sciences.

Stover, Francis, director of legislative service, Veterans of Foreign Wars, accompanied by Norman Jones, administrative director.

Schloss, Irvin F., past national president, Blind Veterans Association, accompanied by Jack H. Street, administrative director.

Burkhardt, Edgar G., national commander, Veterans of World War I, accompanied by Waldron E. Leonard, senior national commander.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 9, 1970

Brill, Dr. Norman Q., professor of psychiatry, UCLA School of Medicine, consultant in psychiatry to Veterans' Administration Hospital, Brentwood.

May, Dr. Philip R. A., professor of psychiatry, UCLA School of Medicine, consultant in psychiatry to Veterans' Administration Hospital, Brentwood.

Capson, Wayne L., president, Paralyzed Veterans of America.

Burns, Michael W., president, California Paralyzed Veterans Association, Inc.

Bullock, William E., claims director, south, national service officer, Disabled American Veterans.

Long, George V., service officer, Alhambra Chapter 22, Disabled American Veterans, Alhambra, Calif.

Sloneker, Lewis S., director of rehabilitation, the American Legion, Department of California.

Strickland, William, past commander, 24th District, the American Legion, Department of California.

Menasco, Otis R., commander, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of California.

Rector, Edmund J., commander, Inland Hospital, Veterans Inland Hospital Committee, Riverside-San Bernardino Area, Calif.

Green, Frederick W., former patient, Brentwood VA Hospital.

Burke, Harry J., Vietnam casualty on active duty.

Roberts, Billy, disabled veteran.

Roberts, John, tax accountant.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 27, 1970

Pannill, F. Carter, M.D., dean, University of Texas Medical School.

Stewart, Douglas J., second-year resident in medicine, University of Miami School of Medicine.

Lifton, Dr. Robert Jay, Foundations' Fund Research professor of psychiatry, Yale University School of Medicine.

Dudrick, Dr. Stanley J., associate professor of surgery, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, chief of surgery, University of Pennsylvania Division, Veterans' Administration Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.

Oliphant, Dr. Beverley, intern, Veterans' Administration Hospital, Washington, D.C., accompanied by Dr. Joseph Backer, first-year resident in medicine, Veterans' Administration Hospital, Washington, D.C.

Rossignuolo, Ralph, legislative director, AMVETS.

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1970

Davidson, Dr. J. Gary, Research Associate in Hematology, Wadsworth VA Hospital, accompanied by Dr. Bernhard Votterl, third-year resident at Wadsworth VA Hospital.

Bottone, Sam, Project Director, California Nurses Association, accompanied by Miss Helen Fogarty, R.N., Head Nurse Ward B4E, Wadsworth VA Hospital.

Lamson, Dr. Baldwin, Director of Hospitals and Clinics, UCLA School of Medicine, and member of the Deans Committee, VA Center, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, then, in accordance with my agreement with the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PAS-TORE) on May 27 I appeared before his appropriations subcommittee to present the results of our subcommittee's oversight investigation. I recommended that \$174 million be added to the VA appropriation in four appropriation bill items dealing with the hospital and medical program.

Mr. President, for the convenience of Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my May 27 testimony, including appendixes, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Subcommittee, it is a great privilege for me to appear this morning to offer my recommendations for the Veterans Administration's fiscal year 1971 appropriation. Although I will make recommendations in a number of areas, the major thrust of my statement will deal with the VA hospital and medical care program.

My medical care recommendations grow out of oversight hearings conducted over the last six months by the Veterans Affairs Subcommittee, which I am privileged to chair, of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. The topic of the hearings was "Medical Care of Veterans Wounded in Vietnam." I announced these hearings last Veterans' Day when I discussed with Chairman Pastore on the Senate floor the problem of deficiencies in the VA hospital program and increased demands upon it because of the war in Vietnam. I withdrew an amendment proposing a \$50 million increase in the VA's FY 1970 medical care budget, to permit time for a detailed study of the needs of the VA hospital system and development of recommendations for necessary appropriations.

Our Veterans Affairs Subcommittee held a series of hearings stretching from November 21 to April 28. I am submitting for your official Subcommittee review and records

the printed transcript of the first six days' hearings, and the prepared statements from the April 28 hearing. In connection with this latter hearing, which inquired into patient care at a typical VA hospital, the Wadsworth Hospital at the VA Center in Los Angeles, I am also submitting numerous affidavits from physicians and nurses corroborating the shocking testimony which we received about the totally unclean and life-risking and life-wasting conditions at that hospital. In addition, I have with me 27 photographs showing some of these conditions. Since there are no duplicates of these photographs, which are part of the official Labor and Public Welfare Committee record, I cannot submit them for your record, but I would be delighted to make them available to the Subcommittee should it wish to examine them.

This morning I am recommending that you add approximately \$189 million to the total VA appropriation in H.R. 17548. The precise amounts and purposes are outlined in Appendix I to my statement. I recognize this is a very substantial increase, especially the \$174 million for the four appropriation bill items dealing with the medical and hospital program. However, I wish to assure the Subcommittee at the outset that I have attempted to be conservative in my estimates of the needs and the dollars to meet them. I have also tried to ascertain to the maximum extent possible that all of these funds could be prudently and effectively obligated or expended in fiscal 1971 to meet real and pressing needs which will otherwise go unmet. We all know that, given this administration's anti-inflation policies, Veterans Administration officials are bound to state publicly that they cannot use additional funds. But I am convinced from private discussions and my personal inquiries that all the money I am requesting can be spent effectively and is urgently needed.

My recommendations fall into six major categories, and for each category I am submitting to the Subcommittee in Appendix II detailed backup data where necessary. I would like to sketch for you now the deficiencies as I see them in our veterans hospitals and outline some of the appropriation remedies that I propose. I also wish to stress, however, that to a considerable extent the problems presently besetting the VA hospital and medical care program cannot be cured by the appropriation of more money alone. Thus, I have prepared a comprehensive legislative program providing new authorities for the VA, which I will be introducing for consideration as soon as the FY 1971 appropriations process is completed.

In my 16 months as chairman of the Veterans Affairs Subcommittee, I have concluded that one vital precept should govern Congressional action regarding veterans' programs—the principle that the cost of providing first quality medical care, along with equitable education and other readjustment benefits, and disability and indemnity compensation, must be counted as part of the cost of war. They are just as integral a part of the cost of war as the money we spend on the weapons and armaments for combat. Sometimes we tend to lose sight of this. I think that the administration has overlooked this very basic premise. In its understandable desire to retard inflation, it is asking double sacrifices from the men who have answered their country's call to battle. The war they are fighting is itself a principle cause of inflation. To use inflation now as an excuse for denying these veterans the level of services and benefits they deserve is intolerable.

MEDICAL CARE

With that background, let us look at the FY '71 medical care appropriation item in the bill before the subcommittee. It is true that, as the Veterans Administration has stated repeatedly, the \$1.752 billion proposed budget—to which the House added \$25 mil-

lion for a total of \$1.777 billion—constitutes a record amount for VA medical care. But our subcommittee investigation and a careful scrutiny of the budget indicates that, actually, it is at best a standstill budget. And it may well be a regressive one. This is so even after the President's April 2 restoration of \$50 million which the Bureau of the Budget had sliced from the VA's budget and of \$25 million more won on the floor of the House of Representatives by my good friend, Chairman Teague of the House Veterans Affairs Committee.

This so-called record budget is still \$50 million below the level estimated as necessary for FY 1971 more than a year ago by the Department of Medicine and Surgery, the VA's own chief physicians and medical administrators. And since that time both the demands for care and the cost of providing it have inflated beyond expectation.

The 1971 medical care figure in the bill is \$122 million more than has been appropriated for fiscal year 1970, including the very urgently needed amounts contained in the House-passed FY '70 supplemental appropriation bill. Such a 7.5 percent increase barely meets the enormously inflating cost of providing medical care. And it certainly does not come near to dealing adequately with what I can only characterize as a dangerously enlarging crisis in the VA medical care system.

This crisis did not occur overnight. It did not occur in the last year or so. Rather, it is the result of a steady erosion over the last five years. Thus, both a Democratic and a Republican administration, as well as the Congress itself, share responsibility for the state of affairs that now confronts us in VA hospitals. Determining who is responsible is unimportant. The crucial thing is who can and will take action to make the needed major improvements.

It is a bitter irony that this deterioration in the quality of medical care we offer our disabled veterans is due largely to the war itself. It has been five years since our increased military involvement in Southeast Asia began to bring heavy casualties. Yet the VA still does not have an adequate plan to make the necessary adjustments and improvements in its hospital system to meet the desperate needs of our seriously disabled war veterans. This lack of a plan to convert from peace-time to war-time conditions has brought about a deplorable situation. Moreover, the cruel fact is that the cost of waging the war is preventing an adequate level of appropriations to care for our war-maimed. This is because of the monumental direct costs of the war and because of efforts to limit domestic expenditures because of the high level of war spending.

I have talked of a crisis, an enlarging one. It is a crisis caused by taking for granted that things could be done without adequate funds. The direct result is that in many—though fortunately not all—VA hospitals the quality of care provided has suffered from a combination of denial of budget requests largely within the executive branch and the most unfortunate personnel ceiling imposed by the Congress in 1968 and removed only a year ago. This has all led to a process of deferring, year after year, needed expenditures for purchase of equipment and supplies, renovation of facilities, construction of new facilities and acquisition and replacement of staff. And this in turn has yielded some highly tragic and insidious results by draining already hard-pressed direct patient care funds for some of these other vital purposes just to keep the system going.

This process of absorption and deferral of costs masterminded by the Bureau of the Budget has produced a slow but steady erosion which only time reveals. But that deterioration is plainly visible today at a time when greatly increased numbers of Vietnam veterans are entering VA hospitals for treatment. Vietnam veterans now constitute about 10 percent of VA medical workloads.

We all regret the tragic fact that more than 275,000 men have already been wounded in the Indochina war. About half of them require some degree of immediate hospitalization for their wounds and most of these will at some point seek VA hospital or outpatient care. In FY 1970 thus far, over 50,000 Vietnam veterans were admitted to VA hospitals and they made over 500,000 visits for outpatient medical care in FY 1969.

The horrible truth about the war is that it is the most crippling and seriously disabling war we have fought. Out of every 10 veterans wounded in the Vietnam war, one is wounded so grievously that he would have died in a previous war. The result is an increase of seriously disabled veterans—more quadriplegic veterans than ever before and more veterans with multiple injuries—requiring intensive care and rehabilitation in VA hospitals. For example, a survey of wounded Army personnel separated for disability shows a very high separate rate for amputation or paralysis of extremities—together totalling almost 54 percent of all those separated for disability as compared with joint totals of about 28 percent from the Korean conflict and 21 percent from World War II. And over 50 percent of all those separations surveyed were caused by crippling diseases of bones and organs of movement—feet, legs and so forth. This is about double the previous rates from this cause.

These seriously disabled men are saved on the battlefield by excellent and unprecedented medical and surgical field procedures after rapid evacuation, often minutes after being hit from the battlefield by helicopters. But we have sadly discovered that the crisis, high-intensity, almost miraculous care they receive in the service is not often sustained when they end up in a VA hospital despite the dedicated efforts of highly trained and skilled VA medical personnel. For what these most seriously disabled war casualties often find is a deteriorating VA hospital system which I will now describe in more detail for you.

The principle deficiency in VA hospitals today is lack of staff. And this comes at a time when the VA is trying to activate some 150 badly-needed specialized medical services—such as intensive care units, coronary care units, open heart surgery units, pulmonary function units, and more spinal cord injury centers—all of which require intensive staffing directly limiting the staff available for the core hospital. Presently, VA hospitals have an overall staff-to-patient ratio of about 1.5 to 1, as compared to staffing ratios of about 2.7 to 1 for community hospitals. We can all agree that this is a great disparity. Although these two ratios may not be absolutely comparable in all respects, it cannot fairly be contended that those adjustments necessary to provide relative comparability could account for the enormity of this staffing gap.

Indeed, the chairman of the House Veterans Affairs Committee, Olin E. Teague, who with his most dedicated and able staff has been of great assistance to our investigation, has been proposing for the past five months that VA general hospitals reach a staffing ratio of 2:1, and psychiatric hospitals of 1:1. It would cost about \$200 million more than I recommend today for staffing in order to achieve those very desirable levels. But I make no such recommendation now because I do not believe that such an enormous increase can be achieved within one fiscal year.

The VA needs substantial help to overcome the debilitating effects of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act personnel ceiling. Thus, I am recommending adding about \$51 million to fund an additional 5000 staff positions in VA hospitals. Along with the funds already included for staffing increases in the FY '71 medical care item—although there is a real question at this point whether the House-passed amount would really provide

for these increases—this would increase staff ratios to 1.7:1, an improvement which should directly enhance the quality of care delivered to every veteran in each of the 166 VA hospitals.

The next glaring deficiency in the present budget is its failure to provide funds to eliminate equipment and maintenance and repair backlogs which have accumulated over the past several years. Conservative estimates show that these two backlogs total at present more than \$46 million. The use of out-dated and broken-down life-saving and life-sustaining diagnostic and treatment equipment and the continued deterioration of equipment and physical surroundings not adequately maintained or repaired has reached an intolerable level and must be corrected immediately. I consider the elimination of these devastating backlogs essential to the fulfillment of the patient care improvement which is the goal of the improved staff ratio I am recommending. The best X-ray technician cannot function effectively with a defective or out-dated X-ray machine, any more than a highly skilled laboratory technician can perform with inadequate technical facilities.

Moreover, and this is an often overlooked point, VA hospital directors frantically juggling inadequate allotment of funds based on inadequate appropriation levels, are compelled time after time to choose between using funds to hire additional staff and using funds to purchase, renovate or repair urgently needed equipment or other facilities, when both are essential for quality medical care. I propose that we remove this unconscionable burden from the backs of hospital directors so they can get on with the job of recruiting and hiring the additional staff necessary to provide quality care to our veterans.

Now I would like to say a word about the now controversial article which appeared in the May 22 issue of LIFE magazine, copies of which I sent to all members of this Subcommittee last week. The article is entitled, "From Vietnam to a VA Hospital: Assignment to Neglect." This powerful piece of photographic journalism has aroused some extremely strong emotions as well as some rather startlingly categorical denials from Veterans Administration spokesmen. On the basis of the investigation the Subcommittee has conducted, I believe that the article is accurate with respect to the spinal cord injury center at the Bronx VA hospital and that, most shamefully and regrettably, these overcrowded, unsanitary, undermanned conditions do indeed exist for these maimed veterans on a day-to-day basis. Moreover, the lack of adequate numbers of staff characterizes these VA units throughout the country.

In order for the Subcommittee members themselves to judge the Veterans Administration denunciation of the LIFE article and its accusations about the integrity of the photographs, I have asked an individual who was present when the photographs were taken to be available this morning to answer any questions the Subcommittee might have about the circumstances under which the photographs were taken and the conditions that exist and have existed for a number of years in the Bronx VA hospital. I now ask that Donald Broderick, Executive Director of the Eastern Paralyzed Veterans Association, come forward. Mr. Broderick has been a paraplegic for fourteen years; he himself was rehabilitated at the Bronx VA hospital, and has been intimately familiar with its workings in his present capacity over the past two years. Mr. Broderick has advised me that he would welcome any questions you have regarding the article or hospital conditions for the spinal cord injured veteran.

Now I would like to return to the plight of our spinal cord injured and what I recommend be done to alleviate it. The ratio in

the VA spinal cord injury units at present is approximately 1.02 staff to service each spinal cord injury bed. In striking and stark comparison, I have been advised by Dr. Howard Rusk, world famous director of the Institute of Rehabilitation Medicine in New York City, that the exactly comparable ratio at his institution is 2.17:1—a ratio more than twice as high. Nothing more graphically explains the problems at the Bronx VA spinal cord injury center. And no set of statistics more accurately illustrates to me why, when I visited the physical therapy facilities at Dr. Rusk's institution, I found a whirlwind of activity with at least fifteen patients attended by what seemed like twice as many staff actively engaged in the arduous and painful process of physical and spiritual rehabilitation. Whereas at VA spinal cord injury centers—many equipped with physical rehabilitation equipment every bit as good as that at the New York Institute—I have found at one time only a few patients actively engaged in therapy while others waited in a prone line for their turn and others no longer had the incentive to come and wait.

This is because the intensive and highly personal therapy needed to overcome the terrible disabilities which afflict these veterans is really a matter of two hands and a heart, rather than particularly sophisticated equipment. Therefore, I propose that by the end of fiscal 1971 we provide the Veterans Administration with sufficient funds for salaries—about \$6 million in the first year—and provision of on-the-job training—about \$4 million—to double the spinal cord injury staffing ratio and provide care comparable to that available at a facility like the Institute of Rehabilitation Medicine.

In making this SCI proposal, I wish to stress that it will be necessary for the VA to train the individuals to fill the approximately 1145 new positions, for these are scarce skills. Dr. Rusk has impressed upon me that it would be a grave misfortune if we were to drain off urgently needed rehabilitation personnel from the other relatively few physical medicine and rehabilitation facilities in this country. Rather, I propose that the VA enter upon a systematic program of training and education of the new personnel, the vast majority of whom fall in paramedical or paraprofessional categories, to deliver this priority treatment.

I am also recommending the addition of approximately \$5.8 million to eliminate a dental examination and treatment backlog (44,700 examinations and 8,600 treatments) that will plague the VA by the close of the present fiscal year, as well as to provide 25,000 additional examinations and 20,000 additional treatments not estimated when the FY '71 budget was proposed. These examinations and treatments will be able to be carried out only through fee arrangements at the cost of approximately \$232.43 per treatment and \$29.88 per examination (in light of the VA's own dental staff being fully occupied in processing an unprecedented influx of dental applications from returning Vietnam veterans). I find it totally unacceptable that such veterans are forced to wait many, many months—some as much as six or more—from the time of application to the time they actually receive the dental care they require.

Although I have focused primarily upon increasing demands being made upon the VA hospital and medical care system by our disabled Vietnam veterans, we must not overlook the equally justifiable needs of our veterans of prior wars. And we must not permit our great concern over the large influx of Vietnam veterans into VA facilities to cause us to forget that the same inadequate conditions afflict all veterans—regardless of the war they fought. Of particular concern is the growing need for long-term care facilities for aging and infirm veterans not requiring intensive hospital care. Although the

FY 1971 budget contains funds to expand the VA's own nursing home system by about 1,000 beds. I believe that this continues to place too great a reliance on already pressed community nursing homes in the private sector, over which the VA does not exercise direct quality control. Since it is clear that there are a number of locations at which VA hospital beds are not presently in use and do not appear likely to be used in the future, given improved VA turnover rates, I propose an additional \$6 million to provide for conversion of 1,000 such beds to nursing care use.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF HEALTH PERSONNEL

Presently within the medical care item the VA budget includes about \$100 million for education and training of health personnel in VA hospitals and clinics. The VA system is the greatest single health personnel trainer in this country, and it has enormous potential for growth at a time when it is confronted by a large internal staffing shortfall, as well as by a great shortage of health personnel in the country generally. I thus propose the addition of approximately \$19 million to provide for the training of approximately 1,274 more allied health professionals in over 20 specialties, 60 intensive care specialists and 210 physician's assistants, as well as for the training of the urgently needed approximately 1,150 spinal cord injury personnel I described earlier.

There are two very significant points I wish to make about the great importance of the health personnel education and training program in the VA. First, if the VA is ever to improve substantially its staffing ratios, it must do so with paramedical and paraprofessional personnel. There are not available in the general community enough physicians and registered nurses to meet the VA's, let alone the country's need for these professionals. Thus, I believe that it is an urgent priority for the VA to continue large education and training programs for the direct benefit of its veteran patients.

In addition, a vibrant, innovative and progressive education and training program is, along with major research efforts, an indispensable element in maintaining high quality professional staff with good morale and providing high quality patient care. Thus, the affiliation of over half of the VA's hospitals with 78 of the most outstanding medical schools in this country is the single most responsible factor for having sustained a reasonable quality of professional care in VA hospitals to date.

In order to ensure that education and training of health personnel assumes the importance I have just outlined in the VA budget picture, I strongly recommend to the subcommittee that (1) a separate item entitled, "Education and Training of Health Personnel" be established in the appropriation bill; (2) approximately \$118,909,000 be earmarked in this item to include the cost of trainee stipends, instructor salaries, necessary physical renovations, supplies, equipment, and miscellaneous expenses; and (3) along with creation of this appropriation item, the medical care item be decreased by approximately \$66.5 million (including devotion to full-time patient care of those professionals now diverting some of their patient care attention to teaching activities). Establishment of this new appropriation item should serve to prevent the diversion of money appropriated for education purposes to providing patient care, an altogether understandable but, as I have tried to indicate, shortsighted practice to counteract inadequate provision of funds for patient care.

MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH

I have two basic recommendations with respect to the medical and prosthetic research item presently earmarked at \$59,200,000, a three percent increase over the fiscal

year 1970 level. First, as I have indicated, an active large medical research program is absolutely indispensable to attracting and retaining high caliber personnel in the VA system. There are just no two ways about that fact. And the VA research program has been a most worthy one, making numerous major contributions to medical science. However, because it has operated at a funding level over the past several years permitting only a continuation of ongoing research and no significant new projects, the outstanding results it has achieved have not been translated into direct improvements in patient care. In order to provide for this process of direct application of research learning, I propose, first, that the title of this item in the appropriation bill be amended to add at the end "and development" and that \$17 million be added largely to fund such developmental activities and other projects indicated in Appendix I aimed at providing greater relationship between research and improvement of patient care in VA hospitals. The addition of this \$17 million merely provides the level of funding estimated to be necessary by the VA's own Department of Medicine and Surgery last year.

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

Having been badly restricted in hospital construction by an over-all freeze on federal construction projects in FY 1970, the VA plans a major construction effort in FY 1971 with the appropriation of \$10 million less than was appropriated last fiscal year and use of an equal amount of carryover funds. However, in several areas, I do not believe that adequate priority has been provided for urgently needed projects.

First, I was greatly shocked to learn in our hearings that there are 43 VA hospitals—in some of the hottest areas of our country—which, although qualifying for air conditioning, are not air conditioned and for which no air conditioning design funds are being requested in FY 1971. I think it is totally unacceptable for veterans in Amarillo and Kerrville, Texas; Wichita, Kansas; Bay Pines, Florida; Fayetteville, Arkansas; Gulfport, Mississippi, and numerous other similarly hot climates, to swelter in un-air-conditioned facilities. I thus propose an addition of approximately \$6.2 million in this appropriation item to prepare designs for air conditioning of these 43 hospitals and an additional \$540,000 for the necessary personnel to execute these designs (to be added to the Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses appropriation item).

Also regarding the construction item, in light of the disclosures in our hearings as well as in the recent LIFE article, of intolerable and wholly inadequate physical conditions for providing up-to-date hospital care, I recommend that a Congressional priority be established for creating design plans for constructing replacement hospitals at Bronx, New York and Wadsworth, Los Angeles VA Center. I also propose that funds be added for modernization of the Brentwood Hospital at that center. That neuro-psychiatric hospital is confronted with a continuation of being able to provide care only through drugs unless major improvements are made in its physical plant in order to alter this problem and attract qualified psychiatrists and psychiatric personnel to work at that center. For these three projects, I recommend an addition of \$13 million.

Finally, with respect to the overall VA hospital and medical care situation, I wish to stress that the deteriorating conditions that I have outlined are not the rule at every VA hospital. In some VA hospitals a high quality of care is being offered. In all VA hospitals a most dedicated and highly skilled staff is doing its best, although too often under medieval working conditions. And they

deserve the praise and recognition of all Americans.

At the same time, however, the conditions which have recently been publicized with respect to VA hospitals are by no means isolated instances. In our investigation and in the investigation carried out by the House Committee on Veterans Affairs numerous examples of similarly deteriorating situations at hospitals around the country were presented, and I will provide chapter and verse in this regard if the subcommittee wishes. Moreover, the deficiencies in the VA hospital system have been fully corroborated before our subcommittee by some of the most eminent medical school professors in the country as well as representatives of the various veterans organizations. Representative excerpts from their testimony are set forth in Appendix III.

One major caveat with respect to all the medical program recommendations I have made: neither the present FY 1971 medical and hospital program appropriation, nor the recommendations that I have made for increased staffing, take into account the recent six percent pay increase. That will cost the VA an estimated \$60 million in medical personnel alone. It is vitally important that the VA not be required to absorb any of this pay raise in the funds ultimately appropriated to it in this bill. I urge the subcommittee to include in its report strong language indicating the clear expectation that supplemental funding will be sought in the next Congress to cover the pay increase and that the VA will receive a deficiency spending authorization in its initial quarterly allotment from the Bureau of the Budget.

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

The final recommendation that I wish to make is the addition of some \$15 million to the general operating expenses item. This is first, to provide for implementation of the new outreach services program established in the recently enacted Public Law 91-219 (implementing the VA estimate over two years). And second, it is to provide approximately 200 more Department of Veterans Benefits field personnel to assist in coping with the expected more than 33 percent increase in veterans' benefit applications over the level experienced in 1968 while processing personnel levels have increased only insignificantly since then and to eliminate repetition of the uneconomic and counterproductive DVB policy of regularly authorizing overtime—more than \$3 million in FY 1970.

I would be glad to answer any questions which the subcommittee might have about my testimony and our investigation of the VA hospital and medical care system.

APPENDIX I

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR AND OTHER AMENDMENTS TO VA 1971 APPROPRIATION IN H.R. 17548, INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1970, RECOMMENDED BY SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON, MAY 27, 1970

A. MEDICAL CARE ITEM

1. Funds for 5000 additional general medical care personnel to bring overall hospital staff ratio up to 1.7:1 (administration added funds for 3600 positions and House committee/Teague amendment added funds for 1000 more, equalling 4600; cumulative personnel increases sought by VA in FY 68 (3389), FY 69 (3376), and FY 70 (3586) total 10,351 less 866 added in FY 70 yield a deficiency of 9485; leaving about 5000 more funded positions needed at approximately \$10,300 per position), \$51,500,000.

2. Funds for salaries to double present spinal cord injury staffing ratios by end of FY '71 (see item A.5.d. for training funding for these new personnel) (present VA SCI staffing level is 1.02:1 bed; whereas ratio (excluding research and teaching personnel) at Institute of Physical Medicine Rehabilitation (NYU) is 2.17:1; total salary costs for

present SCI 1145 FTE positions is \$11,271,000 for FY '70; approximately one half of this—increased to \$12,000,000 to cover 6 percent pay raise—is needed for salaries to reach 2:1 ratio), \$6,000,000.

3. Funds to eliminate equipment and maintenance and repair backlogs (\$49,000,000 backlog reported to House Veterans Affairs Committee by Administrator of Veterans Affairs on April 14; \$5,000,000 added in FY 70 supplemental and assuming \$12,000,000 in \$50 million requested by President and granted by House and \$10 million in House committee/Teague amendment were for this purpose, there now is \$27 million provided for this purpose; this leaves \$22 million needed for equipment; in addition, HVAC questionnaire to Hospital Directors showed in 1970 deferred maintenance and repair needs totaling \$24,600,000 which are as yet unfunded), \$46,600,000.

4. Funds for dental care to eliminate June 30, 1970, case backlog and meet revised FY 71 caseload projection based on recent FY 70 experience (end FY 1970 case backlog estimated at 44,700 examinations and 8600 treatments and for FY 1971 25,000 more examinations and 20,000 more treatments than originally projected; each fee examination costs \$29.88 and each fee treatment costs \$232.43, requiring \$8,722,000; House Committee/Teague amendment restored \$3 million for this purpose, leaving \$5,722,000 still needed), \$5,722,000.

5. Education and Training: (a) Physician's Assistant (210 students, 84 instructors, supplies and non-recurring costs), \$4,830,000; (b) Allied Health Training (1274 trainees, 189 instructors, supplies and other costs, in over 20 specialties), \$9,293,000; (c) Pilot Program to Train Health Specialists in Intensive Care (60 trainees, 24 instructors, equipment, space renovation, miscellaneous), \$1,000,000; (d) Training of Spinal Cord Injury Personnel to double ratio at SCI centers (1145 trainees, 200 instructors, space renovation, supplies, miscellaneous), \$4,000,000; subtotal, \$19,123,000.

6. Activation of 1000 additional nursing care beds (through conversion of unused present hospital beds; FY '71 includes increase of such 1155 beds), \$5,915,000.

Total, \$134,860,000.

B. MEDICAL AND PROSTHETIC RESEARCH ITEM

1. Amend title to add "and Development" (Present level of \$59,200,000—a 3 percent increase over FY 1970—representing an actual cutback in research given 10 percent inflation costs in research; provides for no new appreciable research projects—"development" function is to translate research results directly to improvement of patient care).

2. Add 20% for development generally (Radiosotope; atomic medicine; pulmonary function labs; electron microscopy; automated laboratory procedures, and 65 medical and 6 paramedical additional patient care/research and education traineeships now approved but unfunded (\$2,266,706)), \$12,000,000.

3. Fund demonstration project for regionalization in Los Angeles, Southern Central California, area (Small construction projects, communications and travel to combine services of 5 hospitals and one domiciliary facility), \$1,000,000.

4. New project to research and develop method of transferring total community-based mental health concept (including attitudinal therapy program) to VA general and NP hospitals to lead to more individualized, sympathetic and compassionate care (VA NP Hospital, Tuscaloosa, Alabama), \$500,000.

5. Health facilities and services delivery R&D (Strongly recommended by former Ass't. Sec'y. for Health and Scientific Affs.—presently Chancellor of San Francisco Medical Center—Dr. Philip Lee), \$3,500,000.

Total (Brings research budget to \$76,000,000 figure sought originally to DM&S within VA), \$17,000,000.

C. MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSES ITEM

1. Restore amount originally sought by DM&S and cut within VA (In order to carry out other recommended expanded medical programs), \$2,487,000.

2. Fund twenty-seven more personnel positions (architect/engineers) to carry out 37 of the designs in D.1 at \$20,000 per slot—only six additional designs can be made by present staff), \$540,000.

Total, \$3,027,000.

D. CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES ITEM

1. Expedite design for air-conditioning of 43 VA hospitals qualifying for airconditioning but unairconditioned and without designs (Listed in Appendix II; at \$140,000 per design), \$6,020,000.

2. Modernization of Brentwood NP Hospital, \$5,000,000.

3. Design plan for replacement hospital at Bronx, New York (8% of estimated costs), \$4,000,000.

4. Design plan for replacement hospital at Wadsworth, L.A. VA Center, California (8% of estimated cost), \$4,000,000.

Total, \$19,020,000.

E. GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES ITEM

1. Add to implement new "Outreach Services Program" of Public Law 91-219 (VA estimate in comment on proposed bill was \$25,078,252; 2 years allowed for implementation), \$12,539,000.

2. Add funds for 200 more DVB field staff to process benefit applications (to eliminate continual overtime costs which for FY 1970 are estimated to be—\$3,150,000; cost of 200 staff full-time is about 30 percent cheaper than overtime cost for same services and about three new positions per field office, \$2,226,000).

3. Add funds for 75 more clerical personnel to process dental care additional authorizations (see item A.4: \$6,600 per position—average of 1½ persons needed at busiest 50 stations), \$500,000.

Total, \$15,265,000.

F. NEW EDUCATION AND TRAINING ITEM

1. Establish separate appropriation bill item for education and training of health personnel (\$99,786,000 included in initial FY '71 budget for E&T plus \$19,123,000 proposed to be added in item A.1; total to be earmarked is \$118,909,000 including adequate funds for instructors).

2. Decrease total medical care item accordingly (by \$66,447,000; less than total of initial E&T earmarking to preserve medical care staff who was devoting some time to teaching).

Grand total, \$189,172,000.

APPENDIX II

PROPOSED INCREASES TO ELIMINATE EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT BACKLOG (ITEM A.3, APPENDIX I)

The Veterans Administration's approximately \$49 million equipment replacement backlog which will exist at the beginning of FY 1971 includes equipment which, having lived its usual life according to established tables of amortization, will become eligible for possible replacement during the FY 1971.

According to studies made in the past to determine the distribution of the nearly \$400,000,000 investment in personal property, approximately 45% of this backlog, or \$22 million, consists of therapeutic and diagnostic equipment, such as:

Beds and other ward and clinical furniture and equipment, \$8.8 million.

X-ray equipment, \$6.3 million.

Blood and body chemistry analyses and other automated laboratory equipment, \$3.2 million.

Equipment required in surgery, \$3.3 million.

Dental diagnostic and treatment equipment, \$0.7 million.

Studies indicate that approximately 55% of this backlog, or about \$27 million, consists of general hospital equipment, some major categories of which are:

Furniture for patient day recreation and waiting rooms, solaria, visitor areas, libraries, quarters & offices, \$5.3 million.

Machinery & equipment—therapy, laundry, cleaning, food conveyors, frozen food cabinets, dishwashers, etc., \$4.6 million.

Ovens, ranges, stoves, bake shop and kitchen equipment, \$3.6 million.

Office machines and equipment, \$5.3 million.

Proposed pilot program to train health specialists in intensive care (Item A.5c, Appendix I)

Instructional Staff:	Costs
5 physicians.....	\$144,715
12 nurses.....	177,812
4 technical.....	43,663
3 administrative support.....	23,791

Subtotal..... 389,981

Trainee Stipends: 60 Trainees....	406,769
Equipment.....	62,000
Space Renovation.....	86,250
Miscellaneous: (contractual services, etc.).....	55,000

Grand total..... 1,000,000

PROPOSED PHYSICIAN'S ASSISTANT PROGRAM EXPANSION (ITEM A.5a., APPENDIX I)

For an additional \$4.8 million, 42 physician's assistant programs can be effectively mounted, as follows:

Radiologist's assistant.....	4
Physician's assistant (general).....	11
Surgical assistant.....	10
Orthopedic assistant.....	5
Pathologist's assistant.....	9
Urologist's assistant.....	3

Total..... 42

The estimated costs would be:

5 students per program times 42 equals 210 students at \$6,000... \$1,260,000

2 instructors per program times 42 equals 84 instructors at \$15,000..... 1,260,000

Supplies: \$1,000 per student times 210 students..... 210,000

Nonrecurring costs, equipment and space \$50,000 per program times 42..... 2,100,000

Total..... 4,830,000

Program sites would be as follows:

1. Radiologist's assistant (4): San Francisco, California; Indianapolis, Indiana; Wood, Wisconsin; Louisville, Kentucky.

2. Physician's ass't (gen'l) (11): Durham, North Carolina; Birmingham, Alabama; Dallas Texas; Houston, Texas; Buffalo, New York; Iowa City, Iowa; Nashville, Tennessee; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Minneapolis, Minnesota; San Francisco, California; Seattle, Washington.

3. Surgical assistant (10): Birmingham, Alabama; Durham, North Carolina; Richmond, Virginia; Denver, Colorado; Seattle, Washington; Chicago West Side, Illinois; Iowa City, Iowa; Houston, Texas; Miami, Florida; Nashville, Tennessee.

4. Orthopedic assistant (5): Seattle, Washington; San Francisco, California; Iowa City, Iowa; Birmingham, Alabama; Chicago Research, Illinois.

5. Pathologist's assistant (9): Durham, North Carolina; Kansas City, Kansas; Cleveland, Ohio; West Haven, Connecticut; Madison, Wisconsin; Birmingham, Alabama; Houston, Texas; Chicago West Side, Illinois; Salt Lake City, Utah.

6. Urologist's assistant (3): Minneapolis, Minnesota; Memphis, Tennessee; Undesignated.

APPENDIX II.—DETAILS OF PROPOSED TRAINING OF ALLIED HEALTH AND SPECIALIZED MEDICAL SERVICE PERSONNEL (ITEMS A.5 AND E.1 OF APPENDIX I)

Field	Trainees		Instructors		Additional funds required for		Total
	Number	Cost	Number	Cost	Space modification	Other costs	
Alcoholism counseling.....	20	\$120,000	6	\$75,000		\$18,000	\$213,000
Blind specialist.....	10	60,000					60,000
Dental training.....	150	405,000	15	182,000	\$225,000	330,000	1,142,500
Electroencephalograph technician.....	20	54,000	2	20,000		10,000	84,000
Histopathology technician.....	10	27,000					27,000
Inhalation therapy.....	20	66,000	5	67,000		10,000	143,000
Medical technology.....	90	216,000	23	266,000	100,000	100,000	682,000
Nuclear medicine technician.....	10	37,000				10,000	47,000
Nurse anesthetist.....	50	180,000	16	210,000		50,000	440,000
Pharmacist's assistant.....	45	153,000	4	44,000		15,000	212,000
Pharmacy interns and residents.....	80	600,000	16	319,500			919,500
Psychology.....	150	900,000	15	304,000		8,000	1,212,000
Radiologic technician.....	80	160,000	22	242,000	57,000	100,000	559,000
Social work.....	150	480,000	11	184,000	5,000	31,000	700,000
Basic nurse.....	(a)	(a)	46	673,000	5,000	30,000	708,000
Registered nurse.....	50	330,000					330,000
Practical nurse.....	50	326,000					326,000
Nursing intern.....	6	36,000					36,000
Nursing resident.....	6	37,000					37,000
Biomedical instrumentation technician.....	25	75,000	8	120,000		55,000	250,000
Certified laboratory assistant.....	40	60,000					60,000
Audiologist and speech pathologist.....	80	360,000					360,000
Dietetic intern.....	15	90,000					90,000
Occupational therapy.....	50	155,000					155,000
Rehabilitation technology.....	67	500,000					500,000
Total.....	1,274	5,427,000	189	2,707,000	392,000	676,000	9,293,000

(a) Basic nursing students are not paid stipends.

The non-trainee costs do not pertain only to the increased numbers of trainees. They are applicable also to the increased need for instructors, etc., for trainees already in the system in order to improve quality of training.

The funds indicated above will be used in all states other than Alaska and Hawaii. This is because there is training going on in all VA hospitals, and the wide variety of indicated training makes it a certainty that some funds will be distributed to VA hospitals in all States.

RATIONALE FOR ADDITION OF "DEVELOPMENT" TO RESEARCH ITEM

(Item B.1 and 2, Appendix I)

Two closely related issues are important to current efforts to improve the quality of health services in this country. The first is concerned with the timely translation of facts of scientific discovery into terms which can be effectively utilized by doctors in the day-to-day practice of medicine. The second is concerned with refining and coordinating methods, instruments, drugs, physical plants and human resources for the delivery of health services.

Accomplishing these goals is, in part, an educational function. In equal or larger part, however, it is a *developmental* function which bridges the gap separating the practitioner of medicine from the bio-medical researcher. This gap has long been recognized by industries of every type. Hence, research budgets, both public and private, are almost invariably coupled with funds for development. The well-established practice of Research and Development (R&D) funding provides a practical mechanism for the conversion of scientific knowledge to medical utility. In the industrial, physical, pharmaceutical, engineering and other sciences, developmental costs usually run at least 4 to 5 times the cost of basic research.

The failure to provide developmental funds in the health services industry has been a serious deterrent to progress in medicine. Many excellent examples can be drawn from experiences within the medical programs of the Veterans Administration.

Some years ago, VA research was instrumental in the discovery of basic facts, methods and instruments for the use of radioisotopes in the diagnosis and treatment of human illness. In succeeding years there was an inordinate lag in the practical appli-

cation of these modalities. They were no longer topics of research, but neither were they truly ready to be put into the hands of practicing physicians.

The discoveries of pulmonary physiology have likewise necessitated the same prolonged transition. Basic facts from the research laboratory were too long in arriving at the bedside of patients with chronic diseases of the lung.

Work which is not clearly research cannot successfully compete for scarce dollars which are limited to research objectives. Developmental work, on the other hand, is highly suspect when it appeals for funds clearly intended for the immediate care of patients.

At a time when we urgently need to improve health care delivery, the vital developmental function is forced either to borrow from research funds, beg from patient care funds, or, as too often happens, remain unfunded. In the first two instances, the development work competes at a disadvantage and even under the shadow of intellectual dishonesty.

The recognition of development as an integral part of the VA research mission would permit the agency more quickly to advance such vital programs as computerization of clinical laboratories, introduction of new methods for behavior modification of psychiatric and senile patients, preparation of instructional and evaluative methods for hospital employees to assure the re-humanization of health care, automation and improved coordination of patient records, and production of model programs for health service delivery in many categories.

PROPOSED HEALTH FACILITIES AND SERVICES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

(Item B.5, Appendix I)

A new component in health care, called Health Services Research and Development has emerged with more than 300 staff people devoted to health services research. The VA has been in the vanguard of this new activity leading to the identification of criteria by which alternative courses of action may be defined for the best delivery of health care. The VA is in a unique position to undertake further major research in this field.

An area of great potential for improving patient care is research related to patient treatment. The use of the computer in physiological monitoring in intensive care units and the transmission, using telephone lines, of ECG data to a central point for interpretation are two VA projects in this general

area. These projects represent only the barest beginning.

Though progress has been made in developing a patient treatment information system, research is needed to investigate and develop the automation of patient history and physical examination procedures.

An important task would be the development of one or more centers in which the interests, competencies and resources for good health services research are clustered.

The VA could play a major role in architectural design of hospitals and other facilities for optimum delivery of health care. A major emphasis of patient care research should be placed on biomedical engineering in the broadest sense to include integration of systems, structure, electronics, and computer applications.

PROPOSED INDEPENDENT APPROPRIATION FOR EDUCATION & TRAINING

(Item F.1 and 2, Appendix I)

The table on pages 1-9 of the FY 1971 Congressional Submission may be used for reference:

The appropriation for FY 1971 should be as indicated.

The amounts, totalling \$6,126,000, under the heading "Medical Administration and Miscellaneous Operating Expenses" should be subtracted, without replacement, from the appropriation of that title.

The \$60,321,000 for trainee stipends should be subtracted without replacement from "Medical Care." All trainees do not receive stipends. In future years, consideration may be directed to increasing the number of stipended trainees as this may be demonstrated as of value in increasing the total number of trainees.

The \$27,335,000 for instructors should be included, but should not be taken out of "Medical Care." This would permit recruitment of instructors directly, and would permit reimbursement to "Medical Care" for such educational services as are provided.

The items for administrative support and other costs should be included in this appropriation and should not be taken out of "Medical Care."

UNAIRCONDITIONED VA HOSPITALS QUALIFYING FOR AIRCONDITIONING AND FOR WHICH NO DESIGN FUNDS ARE REQUESTED IN FY 1971

(Item D.1, Appendix I)

Albuquerque, N.M.; Amarillo, Tex.; Aspinwall, Pa.; Bay Pines, Fla.; Bonham, Tex.; Brecksville, O.; Castle Point, N.Y.; Chillicothe, O.; Coatesville, Pa.; Columbia, S.C.

Dayton, O.; Newington, Conn.; N. Little Rock, Ark.; Perry Point, Md.; Poplar Bluff, Mo.; Downey, Ill.; E. Orange, N.J.; Fayetteville, Ark.; Fayetteville, N.C.; Fort Howard, Md.

Fort Lyon, Colo.; Fort Thomas, Ky.; Grand Island, Neb.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Gulfport, Miss.; Huntington, W. Va.; Salem Va.; Salisbury, N.C.; San Fernando, Cal.; Indianapolis, Ind. (CRS).

Kerrville, Tex.; Knoxville, Tenn.; Lebanon, Pa.; Lincoln, Neb.; Lyons, N.J.; Marion, Ind.; Martinsburg, W. Va.; Montrose, N.Y.; Mountain Home, Tenn.; Murfreesboro, Tenn.; Temple, Tex.; Tuscaloosa, Ala.; Wichita, Kan.

APPENDIX III

EXCERPTS OF TESTIMONY FROM VETERANS AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE OVERSIGHT HEARINGS (NOV. 21 TO APRIL 28)

Dr. Hugh Luckey, President of the New York Hospital-Cornell Medical Center: "Are we doing all we know how to do for our veterans? The answer is definitely no. Within the limitation of funds, personnel and physical resources, the Department of Medicine and Surgery is doing a fine job. However, we would be deceiving ourselves if we did not admit that we could do better. . . . Do we have reason to be apprehensive about the future of health care in the VA? I would say the answer must be a resounding yes.

"The VA is subject to the same pressures as exist in other areas of our health care system. Salaries of VA full-time professional personnel are not competitive. . . . Many VA facilities are becoming obsolete. Funds to support research are so limited as to restrict this important attraction of high-quality personnel. . . ."

Dr. Russel V. A. Lee, Founder and Consultant, Palo Alto Medical Clinic, and Clinical Professor of Medicine Emeritus, Stanford University: "The veterans hospitals have done a remarkably good job in rehabilitation in many of the hospitals. Some of them are really outstanding, but they are not prepared, without some extra help, for the new burden they are going to have of getting these people back to duty. That means not only physical rehabilitation of the people to their wounds, but vocational rehabilitation so that they will be fitted for some sort of useful life into the future."

Dr. Thomas A. Gonda, Professor of Psychiatry, Associate Dean, Stanford University Medical School, and Director of the Stanford University Hospital: "I won't belabor the point as far as quality is concerned. Insofar as quantity is concerned, I have seen a gradual drift of personnel downward, and now we have an overall ratio of 1.2, or 1.25 personnel per patient in our Veterans' Administration hospital, which is a full teaching hospital; and this compares to a 3-to-1 staffing ratio at the university hospital.

"I think the answer lies somewhere in between for the most optimal veteran's care. Certainly hospitalized veterans deserve more than they are getting.

"[The X-ray facilities are] obsolete, in the worst sense of the word. Broken down in a very, very true sense. The equipment there has to be constantly repaired. . . . the hospital itself has been trying to do something about [it] for some time, and has run into snags, fiscal snags."

Dr. Norman Q. Brill, Professor of psychiatry, UCLA School of Medicine, Consultant in Psychiatry to VA Hospital, Brentwood: "Over the years, I have personally referred many young psychiatrists to the Brentwood Hospital when they have come here looking for jobs, but in almost every instance, they lost interest when told how many patients they would have to treat and that this heavy inpatient load precluded their having time for research. There were many who, if inclined to take a job in the VA expressed a preference for the Long Beach VA Hospital or a county hospital where the doctor-patient ratio on the psychiatric service is closer to 1 to 25.

"The acting hospital medical director is occupying three positions because he can't take any of his very few doctors off of their present assignment to patient care to give him some help; consequently, for almost 1 year, he has functioned as director, assistant director, and chief of professional education of the Brentwood VA Hospital."

Dr. Phillip R. A. May, Professor of Psychiatry, UCLA School of Medicine, Consultant in psychiatry to VA Hospital, Brentwood: "As Doctor Brill told you, 20 years ago, Brentwood was the leading psychiatric center in southern California and at this time, the physical facilities are obsolete, the morale is low, treatment programs are handicapped by not being able to treat patients in the way they ought to be able to, as I see it. The overcrowding has been diminished and used to be appalling. I would say now it's only bad. . . . to take two simple examples, that there are just not enough toilets, not enough washbasins—the ones that they have lack privacy—the showers: two people take a shower at the same time in the same shower stall. This is not the kind of thing which I would expect in a modern psychiatric facility."

" . . . I think in terms of the physical facilities, that Brentwood—for which I speak in particular—I think they are considerably below the level that there is now at many State hospitals. That at many State hospitals, each patient has far more space than they have in Brentwood Hospital at the present time; they have research programs; in terms of treatment, they have the ability and the permission and the authorization to follow patients out into the community and do just the kind of care that I was describing to you."

Dr. Beverly Oliphant, Intern, VA Hospital, Washington, D.C., and Dr. Joseph Backer, First-Year Resident in medicine, VA Hospital, Washington, D.C.: "Some of the medical students from the three university hospitals who rotate through the Veterans Administration hospital as part of their training have described their rotation as 'one of the most frustrating experiences during medical school,' due primarily to 'almost complete inadequacy of ancillary personnel' and 'grossly inadequate care which is the rule at this institution.'"

"I would say the care is poor, and the patient, again, in certain aspects, has good care, as far as the doctors who are present to take care of the patients. But as far as the ancillary personnel, the nursing and the laboratory and X-ray, in all these respects, I feel that the care is very much lacking.

"I am very sorry to sit here and say it, but I find that much of the eagerness that I had when I went to the VA last July as a fresh, young intern, recently graduated from medical school, much of that compassion now has just changed into an apathetic feeling that really disgusts me."

Dr. Stewart Wolf, Regents Professor of Medicine at the University of Oklahoma School of Medicine and Head of Neurosciences of the Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation: "I should like to emphasize . . . the danger of deterioration of what has been a vital force in modern medicine in this country. . . . The current national priorities, as reflected in the personnel ceiling policy and budget cuts imposed on the VA threaten the quality of the veterans medical facilities at a time when they are about to be challenged by a great wave of discharged and handicapped GI's who were drafted to fight on the battlefield without glory. . . ."

"In the recent past the VA has been able to attract the highest quality of professional

staff. Today, however, there is a concern among potential recruits, in part because of the financial strictures, in part due to the vulnerability of the top administration to the winds of political change, but mainly as a consequence of a subtler problem, namely the feeling that the halcyon days are over. Thus, there is a real danger that the administration and the Congress are about to see veterans' hospitals revert to the mediocre status of the 20's and 30's, where tired physicians and political job holders provided the care for the defenders of our country."

Dr. Louis Jolyon West, Chairman of the Department of Psychiatry and Medical Director, Neuropsychiatric Institute, University of California at Los Angeles: "An unhappy example of this regrettable situation can be seen at the Brentwood hospital of the Los Angeles VA Center. Despite the staff's best efforts, Brentwood simply has lacked the resources to keep up with progress being made in state and private hospitals throughout California.

"The residency training program in psychiatry at Brentwood was the leading program in Southern California after the Second World War. However, since the middle '50's, there has been a steady and progressive relative loss of ground. Typically, as the educational program declined, patient care followed. Morale is low, training is stagnant, treatment facilities and treatment programs are lagging behind modern standards. In many aspects they have fallen considerably below the quality of state and county facilities in California today.

"To be blunt, the Brentwood hospital program in 1969 is operating at a level that is mostly still at, or even below the level of 20-25 years ago. The rapid progress that has been made in psychiatry is not reflected there, and Vietnam veterans who are sent to Brentwood do not receive first-class care.

"The physical plant and facilities have not been properly improved. Air-conditioning, standard in all modern hospitals in the area has not been provided. While the previous overcrowding has diminished, certain patient areas are still too crowded, and sanitary facilities are inadequate by current standards. The furniture is mostly old and unattractive. Treatment and testing facilities are inadequate. Staffing levels, especially for physicians, are low. A number of positions lie vacant. . . ."

" . . . But Brentwood is by no means the worst in the system, and I have personally visited veterans hospitals, especially those that are remote from the large population centers . . . where I believe [there are] situations even worse than Brentwood.

"In the absence of the facilities . . . which is hard work and takes very skillful personnel, it is easy enough today for whatever staff exists to fall back upon chemicals, and with chemicals we can make a person comfortable and keep him quiet so he doesn't cause a fuss and upset the routine of the hospital. . . . [He would be] a man with an invisible barrier between him and the rest of the world, a chemical cocoon."

Dr. Philip Lee, Chancellor of the University of California Medical Center in San Francisco, and former Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs at HEW: ". . . I believe the budget cuts and restrictions on personnel have seriously affected the improvements in patient care that are needed in the veterans' hospitals and clinics. I believe that a minimum of \$100 million is needed merely to convert the personnel deficit that has resulted from the ceilings imposed in the past several years.

"Second, funds are needed—about \$100 million annually to build new hospitals and modernize existing hospitals and clinics in order that first-rate care can be provided. . . . Third, funds are needed to construct re-

search and teaching space. . . . These are urgent needs. They will improve patient care as no other investment by the VA can. . . . Fifth, adequate funds need to be provided the VA for a major program of health facilities and health services research.

"Finally, Mr. Chairman, in answer to your basic questions, 'Are we doing all we can about this problem? Are we doing all we must?', the answer is an emphatic no. The tragic fact is we are asking the veteran to pay in his health for the anti-inflationary policies that are followed by the administration. I think we are asking him to pay too high a price."

Dr. Baldwin G. Lamson, Director, UCLA Hospital and Clinics: "At UCLA we are currently operating under some pressure as a result of a heavily worked nursing staff, with a nursing pattern established at 5.5 hours per patient day. In contrast, at the Wadsworth Hospital on a general orthopedic nursing unit, the staffing pattern is currently at 2.7 hours per patient day, and on a medical unit 2.8 hours per patient day.

"The medical intensive care unit was built over one year ago but has never been activated for medical patients. The medical nursing service, which does not have a general purpose intensive care unit, is also unable to provide special duty nurses for critically ill patients. These are often 'speccled' by relatively inexperienced nurses aides. Nursing coverage on the night shift commonly provides only one registered nurse for sixty patients.

"At the present time it will take \$600,000 to replace obsolete equipment and procure needed units to bring the Department of Radiology up to acceptable modern standards for patient care. . . . The X-ray therapy department is overloaded and must be expanded. . . . Equipment should be purchased to replace present 10-year-old obsolete machinery for the radiation therapy department at Wadsworth Hospital to remain accredited for the training of personnel which are so urgently needed, and in order to give the best service to veterans.

"The hospital is badly in need of a second special procedures room to be used for cardiac catheterization and angiographic studies, because of the current waiting list of approximately two months before these procedures can be performed.

"Shortages of personnel require, in order that the critical functions of the hospital may be staffed twenty-four hours a day seven days a week, that several categories of personnel agree to rotate work shifts and serve periods of duty on the evening and night shifts. . . . It is imperative that night, evening, and weekend shifts be staffed with people whose circumstances make these particular shifts attractive to them. . . . In a modern, attractive, well-maintained, equipped and staffed facility, it is possible to obtain voluntary personnel for the unpopular shifts. In a borderline facility this becomes impossible."

Mr. Sam Bottone, Project Director, California Nurses Association, and Miss Dorothy Fogarty, R.N., Los Angeles VA Center: "Nurses at Wadsworth have told me that instead of being able to provide nursing care, they often feel as if they are offering only custodial care. The director of the VA Center, Los Angeles, which includes Wadsworth has described patient care at the Center as 'subminimal' and the staff morale as 'atrocious'. An important reason why the morale is so bad is because nurses feel that they frequently leave work at the end of a tour knowing that they were unable to provide minimal care to their patients.

"In the extended care unit of Wadsworth the nursing hours per patient day is about 1.1 hours. The minimum criteria used by the California State Department of Public Health's Bureau of Licensing and Certifica-

tion is 2.5 hours. If this unit were not a federal facility, it would not be licensed to operate in California."

Drs. J. Gary Davidson and Bernhard A. Votteri, Wadsworth Hospital: "The facilities can be summarily described as filthy. House-keeping deficiencies lead to the accumulation of dirt including feces, bacterial counts rise, and a definite infective risk results. The facilities available for preventing the spread of infection can best be described as medieval. . . . Filthy conditions such as exist at Wadsworth daily were never seen when I was in Vietnam at the station hospital Danang. . . . We must pause to consider how this affects the patient. We have had patients with fevers of 102° and up with pain relieved only by injections, who have literally dragged themselves home rather than tolerate the above conditions. Patients who are dying from malignancies already have cause for depression without having the crowded, filthy environment as a constant depressing influence upon them."

Francis W. Stover, Director of the National Legislative Service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars: "Is the VA providing the quality of care intended by the Congress and to which veterans are entitled? The VFW regrettably answers this question in the negative. . . . Every indicator shows that the VA is not getting the money, personnel, equipment, services, and all those other factors which add up to the finest quality medical care. In the personnel area, the VFW has advocated and strongly recommends that the costs of medical care for veterans be considered as a war cost. . . .

"More basic than this, however, is the need for construction, renovation, and modernization funds. Back in the 1950s President Eisenhower inaugurated a 12-year \$900 million program to renovate and modernize the VA hospital system. President Kennedy reviewed the program and made it a 15-year \$1.3 billion program. It has been estimated that at least \$90 million a year is necessary to keep this program going forward, as contemplated. In recent years, however, the budget for this category has been sharply reduced. For the year 1970 after having some of the money restored, the total is about \$55 million. Because this is a discretionary item, it has suffered the deepest cuts in the VA budget."

Peter L. Lassen, executive director of the paralyzed Veterans of America: "We charge VA with letting down—or giving up—on those very seriously disabled who need so much help in all phases of their recovery and rehabilitation. Appearing before another committee earlier this year, Dr. Engle, Chief Medical Director of the VA, admitted: 'We acknowledge that we have been remiss and have not done an optimum job of preparing patients psychologically and socially for adjustment outside the hospital, and in many instances we may have fostered dependency by prolonged hospitalization.'"

E. H. Golembieski, Director of the American Legion's National Rehabilitation Commission: "The American Legion is gravely concerned over the effects of repeated reductions in budget requests for the Department of Medicine and Surgery on its ability to deliver first-class health services to eligible veterans. . . . The Veterans Administration is being forced to operate what was designed to be a second-to-none medical care program for the nation's sick and disabled veterans with inadequate and arbitrary personnel limitations. . . . At a time when the veteran population is rapidly expanding by the separation of severely disabled veterans of the Vietnam fighting and the continuing routine release of large numbers of servicemen by the armed forces, the VA hospital system is being contracted by the denial of funds necessary to provide for satisfactory professional staffing, operating expenses, the

modernization and construction of necessary medical facilities, and utilization of life-saving and life-prolonging facilities and equipment."

Raymond P. Neal, National Commander, Disabled American Veterans: "In our own state of California, DAV reports reveal there are new medical units, equipment, beds and wards lying idle because of lack of funds for staffing. . . . similar situations exist in the VA hospitals at San Francisco and Palo Alto. The additional patient load of Vietnam veterans is placing a strain on current resources required for treatment of other eligible veterans.

"The following is a cross-section of the DAV National Service Officers' reports: 'VA hospital, Nashville, Tenn.: An intensive care unit valued at \$500,000 is completely idle. A new cardiac unit costing approximately \$200,000 is also idle for lack of funds.

"VA hospital, Jackson, Miss. Two intensive care units now under construction are urgently needed, but will remain idle unless additional funds are provided for necessary staffing."

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, my statement outlined in detail exactly where in my judgment, based on the subcommittee's investigation, additional funds were necessary in order for the VA to provide high quality hospital and medical care to our disabled veterans. And I attempted to pinpoint the major deficiencies which today plague very many of the 166 VA hospitals and have produced the deteriorating situation and the dangerously enlarging crisis that our subcommittee found had developed in that system over the last 5 years. This deteriorating situation is aggravated by the increasing influx into VA hospitals of wounded Vietnam veterans.

I believe that the \$100 million added by the Appropriations Committee will go a long way toward stemming this tragic process, and will permit the VA to make significant improvements in the quality of medical care for our veterans.

Although the \$100 million increase recommended by the Appropriations Committee—\$80 million for the medical care item and \$20 million for construction—would not provide for all the improvements I outlined in my May 27 testimony, I strongly endorse the committee action. I extend my thanks for their outstanding cooperation and courtesy to Chairman PASTORE and the ranking minority member of that subcommittee, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), as well as the acting chairman and ranking minority member of the full Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG). Their dedication to providing quality medical care to our disabled veterans is of long standing and is nowhere more clearly manifested than in their recommending so substantial an increase above the administration budget request for VA medical and hospital program—an increase of \$125 million, including the \$25 million won in the other body by my good friend and associate, OLIN E. TEAGUE, the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

The \$100 million figure was reached after discussions between ourselves and our subcommittee staffs taking account of Veterans' Administration's comments on my recommendations.

Based on the categorization in my testimony, which was in turn based upon our oversight investigation, I have prepared an allocation of the \$100 million to meet those needs of highest priority. I trust that in determining the final allocation of any additional appropriations

the Veterans' Administration will give due consideration to these recommendations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing a proposed reallocation of the additional funds recommended by the Appropriations Committee

in the medical area and construction items among the categories recommended in my earlier testimony be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS FOR \$100,000,000 V.A. FISCAL YEAR 1971 APPROPRIATION INCREASE BASED ON CRANSTON MAY 27 RECOMMENDATIONS TO SENATE INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Item	Cranston original recommendation	Allocation based on committee amendment	Item	Cranston original recommendation	Allocation based on committee amendment
A. MEDICAL CARE ITEM			5. Education and training:		
1. Funds for 5,000 additional general medical care personnel to bring overall hospital staff ratio up to 1.7:1 (administration added funds for 3,600 positions and House committee/Teague amendment added funds for 1,000 more, equalling 4,600; cumulative personnel increases sought by VA in fiscal year 1968 (3,359), fiscal year 1969 (3,376) and fiscal year 1970 (3,596) total 10,351 less 866 added in fiscal year 1970 yield a deficiency of 9,485; leaving about 5,000 more funded positions needed at approximately \$10,300 per position)	\$51,500,000	\$25,000,000	(a) Physician's assistants (210 students, 84 instructors, supplies, and nonrecurring costs)	\$4,830,000	\$2,000,000
2. Funds for salaries to double present spinal cord injury staffing ratios by end of fiscal year 1971 (see item A.5.d. for training funding for these new personnel) (present VA SCI staffing level is 1.02:1 bed; whereas ratio) (excluding research and teaching personnel) at Institute of Physical Medicine Rehabilitation (NHYU) is 2.17:1; total salary costs for present SCI 1145 FTE positions is \$11,271,000 for fiscal year 1970; approximately one half of this—increased to \$12,000,000 to cover 6 percent pay raise—is needed for salaries to reach 2:1 ratio)	6,000,000	3,000,000	(b) Allied Health Training (1274 trainees, 189 instructors, supplies and other costs, in over 20 specialties)	9,293,000	2,000,000
3. Funds to eliminate equipment and maintenance and repair backlogs (\$49,000,000 backlog reported to House Veterans Affairs Committee by Administrator of Veterans Affairs on Apr. 14; \$5,000,000 added in fiscal year 1970 supplemental and assuming \$12,000,000 in \$50,000,000 requested by President and granted by House and \$10,000,000 in House committee/Teague amendment were for this purpose, there now is \$27,000,000 provided for this purpose; this leaves \$22,000,000 needed for equipment; in addition, HVAC questionnaire to hospital directors showed in 1970 deferred maintenance and repair needs totalling \$24,600,000 which are as yet unfunded)	46,600,000	40,000,000	(c) Pilot program to train health specialists in intensive care (60 trainees, 24 instructors, equipment, space renovation, miscellaneous)	1,000,000	1,000,000
4. Funds for dental care to eliminate June 30, 1970, case backlog and meet revised fiscal year 1971 caseload projection based on recent fiscal year 1970 experience (end fiscal year 1970 case backlog estimated at 44,700 examinations and 8,600 treatments and for fiscal year 1971 25,000 more examinations and 20,000 more treatments than originally projected; each fee examination costs \$20.88 and each fee treatment costs \$232.43, requiring \$8,722,000; House committee/Teague amendment restored \$3,000,000 for this purpose, leaving \$5,722,000 still needed)	5,722,000	5,000,000	(d) Training of spinal cord injury personnel to double ratio at SCI centers (1145 trainees, 200 instructors, space renovation, supplies, miscellaneous)	4,000,000	2,000,000
			Subtotal	19,123,000	7,000,000
			6. Activation of 1,000 additional nursing care beds (through conversion of unused present hospital beds; fiscal year 1971 includes increase of such 1,155 beds)	5,915,000	0
			Total	134,860,000	80,000,000
			CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES ITEM		
			1. Expedite design for air conditioning of 43 VA hospitals qualifying for air conditioning but unairconditioned and without designs (listed in app. II; at \$140,000 per design)	6,000,000	6,000,000
			2. Modernization of Brentwood NP Hospital	5,000,000	5,000,000
			3. Design plan for replacement hospital at Bronx, New York (8 percent of estimated cost)	4,000,000	4,000,000
			4. Design plan for replacement hospital at Wadsworth, L.A. VA Center, California (8 percent of estimated cost)	4,000,000	4,000,000
			5. Unallocated		1,000,000
			Total	19,020,000	20,000,000
			Grand total	153,880,000	100,000,000

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I do not propose to detail at this time the situation we found in VA hospitals during the investigation or the specifics of the increased demand made on VA hospitals by returning severely wounded Vietnam veterans. Both of these matters are fully discussed in my May 27 testimony which I have incorporated by reference in this statement.

I do wish to stress, however, that the Vietnam war is the most crippling and seriously disabling war we have ever fought. Nearly 150,000 men have been wounded in the Indochina war seriously enough to require immediate hospitalization, and most of them at some point will seek VA hospital or outpatient care. Their demands for this care from the VA are increasing daily and will continue to increase in the next several years.

The work that we have begun today in adding this \$100 million will help meet that demand in the coming fiscal year. But we must insure that the VA hospital and medical system continues to be funded at a level to build upon this strong start in future fiscal years.

I pledge that we on the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, continuing our close cooperation with the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, will follow up on our

oversight investigation this past year and be vigilant in examining the VA budget request for fiscal year 1972 and subsequent years.

In my 17 months as chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs I have concluded that one vital precept should govern congressional attitudes toward veterans' programs. That is the principle that the cost of first quality medical care, just as for equitable education and other readjustment benefits, and disability and indemnity compensation, should be counted as a basic part of the cost of war. They are just as integral a part of the cost of war as the money we spend on the weapons and armaments for combat.

I think that two administrations in succession have overlooked this fact. This is a nonpartisan matter. It began under the preceding Democratic administration. It continues under the present Republican administration. In their understandable desire to retard inflation, they ask double sacrifices from the men who have answered their country's call to battle. The war they are fighting is itself a principal cause of inflation. To use inflation as a reason for denying these veterans the level of services and benefits they deserve, is intolerable.

The addition of these badly needed additional funds thus represents not only a signal victory for all veterans but also for all Americans who share fully a total commitment to provide the very best care for those men called upon to make such grave sacrifices in battle.

However, our work is not finished today, for these gains can be dissipated unless the House Appropriations Committee in conference accepts the Senate increase and unless the Bureau of the Budget then releases the funds to the Veterans' Administration. I believe that the overwhelming support within the Senate for this \$100 million increase will be clearly demonstrated on the floor today and should serve as the strongest possible mandate to our eventual Senate conferees on this appropriations bill to hold the line on that \$100 million at all costs. I also believe that overwhelming support should provide clear indication to the administration of the urgency of releasing of all of the funds finally appropriated.

In closing, Mr. President, I wish once more to express my great appreciation for their help and dedication to the cause of caring for our war wounded to the great chairman of the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee,

the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), and his distinguished ranking minority colleague, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT). They have performed a most noteworthy service for all Americans.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, again I want to say how much I appreciate the work the Senator from California has been doing in this matter of additional funding for Veterans' Administration hospitals.

On several occasions I have spoken on the need for additional funding for Veterans' Administration hospitals. I spoke at length on this subject on June 9 and indicated my support for Senator CRANSTON, who was taking the lead in trying to obtain more funds for upgrading and improving veterans care.

I understand that the Appropriations Committee has recommended an increase of \$100 million in the medical and hospital appropriation categories, and this amount, plus the \$25 million added in the House, should permit significant improvements in the care available in our VA hospitals.

I am pleased that the committee has made this recommendation and hope that it will be approved by the Senate. Further, I hope that having approved this additional \$100 million, which is vitally needed for maintaining and improving VA hospitals, that the Senate conferees will not recede from this figure when the bill goes to conference.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the estimated allocation to Arkansas if the additional funds recommended by the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) are approved.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated allocation to Arkansas of Veterans' Administration fiscal 1971 budget increase

Additional medical care personnel	\$104,300
Elimination of equipment, maintenance and repair backlog	881,500
Elimination of dental case backlog	38,500
Air conditioning	280,000
Total	1,304,300

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, again I thank the Senator for yielding to me and for doing what he has done in bringing this matter to the Senate.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas very much for his helpful support throughout this effort.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) for the lead he has taken in obtaining more funds for veterans hospitals. Certainly these funds are greatly needed.

We have had many recent reports concerning conditions in our veterans hospitals. My distinguished colleague from California (Mr. CRANSTON) recently testified before the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and gave a vivid and revealing recitation of how conditions have been allowed to deteriorate in many of the veterans hospitals. In my judgment, it is shameful for our Nation to let the deplorable conditions arise and persist. For several months now, I have been in contact with officials at the Veterans' Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the White House. On each occasion, I have been assured of their respective concerns for the problems and have been equally assured that help was forthcoming. The overriding problem is money. President Nixon has asked for additional money for fiscal year 1971 for the hospitals.

Our appropriations subcommittee under the leadership of my distinguished colleague from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) has recommended an increase of \$100 million and the full committee in its June 24 report, backed this increase. I rise now to support the committee recommendations.

We are in the midst of reassessing our national priorities. In doing so, we must not forget that our veterans deserve great consideration because of their sacrifices and their devotion to our country. We must assign our wounded or disabled veterans the highest priority—they deserve it and we are letting them down if we do not recognize it. It is universally recognized in this Chamber, I think, that the men who have shed their blood for the country are entitled to the best medical care we can provide.

Let us honor our commitment to our wounded men and do what is necessary. Our committee and our distinguished colleagues on the committee have studied the matter, examined the complaints and reports of deteriorating care and have made their recommendation. It is a reasonable and a sensible and a humane recommendation. Let us act on their recommendation and vote it into law.

I would make one additional point—we can safely delay many projects such as dams, or office buildings with no loss to anyone—except in time. If we neglect such a project one year, we can get to it the next. This is not the case with veterans medical care—once that care is denied, it is denied for all time. Caring for wounds and war injuries and service-connected disabilities cannot wait. Help is needed now and at once. We cannot safely put off till next year what has to be done right now. Let us give our veterans the consideration they deserve.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his support. I am grateful to him.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it is a great honor to serve as a member of

the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs under the creative leadership of the Senator from California. I am convinced the victory which we are winning today for improving hospital care for veterans would not have occurred had it not been for the gifted leadership which the Senator from California brought not only to the work of our committee but beyond that to a broad public understanding of the disastrous conditions in medical care for GI's in our veterans hospitals around the country.

Mr. President, rarely have our distorted priorities been as acutely and vividly revealed as in the recent discoveries of the kind of care being given to our sick, disabled, and wounded veterans. A touch of tragic irony is added to the ever-growing debate over national priorities when we consider how much we will spend to wage wars, and how little we are spending to repair the bodies and minds of our men who must fight them.

While reasonable men may debate the course of the war in Indochina, I think there can be no debate over the enormous debt we owe to the men who have given—and lost—so much fighting in this and other wars. This is not a matter of foreign policy, defense policy, military spending, or the wisdom of what we are doing or have done in Indochina.

This is a matter of human beings—victims of current and past wars—800,000 a year—who enter our veterans hospitals for care.

Nations make war and peace, but men, young and old, continue to pay the awful price long after they have left the battlefield. Today we give billions of dollars to the battlefield, but we have unconscionably shortchanged the hospitals and care facilities which we owe these men.

The Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) has done a magnificent job this year as chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs. He has conducted extensive hearings which have brought to light the shockingly inadequate care our veterans are now receiving. He has also calculated the amount of funds necessary this year to begin overcoming these inadequacies and begin providing the quality of care which we owe these men.

Mr. President, the Senator from California calculated that \$174 million should be added to the administration budget request in order to meet these needs in the VA medical and hospital care programs. When we consider the \$290 million requested for the SST, the \$1.5 billion for the next step in the ABM, \$3.5 billion for new space adventures, and nearly \$30 million just for Pentagon public relation—I hardly think we should question \$174 million more to begin righting our past neglect.

However, I realize that the budget is extraordinarily close this year. Far more important, I realize that the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices cannot, by itself, reorder our national priorities.

The chairman of this Appropriations Subcommittee, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) had done his best in meeting the recommendations of the

Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON). I commend him for his efforts in adding \$100 million to the House bill for VA medical and hospital care. The committee has risen ably to meet these needs, and I urge strong support of this item by my Senate colleagues.

In Minnesota, for example, this \$100 million could provide up to \$1,021,900 for our VA medical and hospital programs, including recommended figures of: \$355,000 for additional general medical care equipment; \$400,800 for elimination of equipment, maintenance, and repair backlog; \$105,800 for elimination of dental care backlog; \$95,200 for physician's assistants; and \$65,100 for allied health and intensive care training.

I consider this an important step forward in setting our priorities in order. While it is a minimal figure, it will at least begin to erase our history of neglect for our veterans.

I urge the committee to insist upon this figure in conference, and I hope they will convey to the conferees of the other side the overwhelming support of the Senate for the \$100 million increase.

Mr. President, I am delighted that we have made the progress reported today. I strongly commend the Senator from California for his inspired leadership.

Mr. CRANSTON. The Senator from Minnesota has been a very strong member of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, and he has worked hard on the matter before the Senate now. I am very grateful to him for the support he has given.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, my immediate predecessor as chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs.

(Mr. MONDALE assumed the chair as the Presiding Officer.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from California for the fine work he had done in this area. And I also commend Senator PASTORE and the Appropriations Committee, for their interest and responsiveness to this most critical need. It is my understanding that in recent years the Appropriations Committee has actually appropriated the funds that have been requested by the Veterans' Administration. But we all know, particularly as a result of the work done by the distinguished Senator from California, that even the requests by the Veterans' Administration are not sufficient to come to grips with this great need. It is his leadership, along with the active concern and leadership of the Senator from Rhode Island, that has led to this additional \$100 million for medical care and construction of medical and health facilities. And we must realize that even this amount does not quite reach the bare minimum additional requirements, which I understand are \$174 million, about which the distinguished Senator from California has spoken.

I think we probably are most familiar with the problems that we face in our own States. For example, studies of the Veterans' Administration show that in Massachusetts we have a shortage of beds for returning servicemen who are treated at veterans hospitals up there and a seri-

ous shortage of personnel to take care of those veterans. I am sure that the situation in our State is mirrored in other States throughout the country. The serious needs and inadequate conditions have been adequately shown as a result of the hearings held by the Senator from California as chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs.

I think all of us realize that, in the kind of war we are faced with in South Vietnam, the guerrilla type of war, there perhaps are more wounded than in any other kind of war this country has been involved in. It is a boobytrap and a landmine type of war, which has caused the loss of arms and legs and other kinds of injuries which require years and years of rehabilitation and care.

I feel that when this country is prepared to spend so many billions of dollars in terms of our efforts in South Vietnam, it not only should certainly be prepared to spend what is really this minimum figure—which this additional appropriation approaches—but also should be prepared to spend what is the full figure necessary to provide the first-rate kind of care and attention these men so richly deserve.

The distinguished Senator from California has, I think, focused the attention of this body and that of all Americans on this critical national need.

I wish to support his urging that the Appropriations Committee stand by this minimum figure in the conference. There is a great need for it. The case has been made that it is the very least we ought to be prepared to do to meet the shortage in terms of facilities and personnel.

I again commend my colleague from California for the work and leadership he has provided in this field.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his helpful and constructive statement. As the Senator has stated, it is true that the Appropriations Committee has always given to the Veterans' Administration what it has requested. The fact is, however, that as to amounts above that figure, the Bureau of the Budget has refused to ask for what is needed. It is that gap which I think we have begun now to cure, with the help of the Appropriations Committee.

I yield now to the distinguished Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES).

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from California for yielding to me briefly to comment on this important subject.

There is one aspect of the war in Indochina on which we can all agree—that the brave men who have been wounded or otherwise disabled in the service of their country, now numbering more than 275,000, deserve the finest medical, hospital, and rehabilitation treatment that a grateful Nation can provide. Needless to say, the same first-rate treatment and care should be provided for those injured in previous wars.

The question before the Senate on H.R. 17548, the Independent Offices Appropriations for fiscal 1971, reported by the Appropriations Committee on June 24, is whether or not we are making adequate funding provision to give our

wounded veterans the level of care to which they are entitled.

It is my privilege to serve on the Veterans' Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, under the able chairmanship of Senator CRANSTON, of California.

In his detailed testimony before the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Senator CRANSTON gave convincing evidence of the need for an increase of at least \$174 million for the VA medical budget. This represents an increase of about 9 percent.

As you know, Mr. President, the proposed budget—to which the House added \$25 million—is a record amount for VA medical care.

But this does not, in any sense, prove that we are meeting the true current needs.

We are engaged in the most crippling and seriously disabling war in our history. We are in a period of rapidly rising costs.

For these and other reasons, the total VA appropriation in H.R. 17548 is simply not enough to meet the standards of care needed for the 800,000 patients our VA hospital system treats each year.

The Senate Appropriations Committee recommended an increase of \$100 million in the medical and hospital appropriation categories. This, added to the \$25 million that was added to the budget in the House, will go a long way toward providing the kind of improvements in the quality of care in our VA hospitals that Senator CRANSTON showed us to be so vitally needed.

I would, therefore, with all of the persuasion at my command, urge the Senate conferees, when the time comes, to stand fast with the Senate figure and not recede.

I cannot believe that anyone could read Senator CRANSTON's eloquent, detailed, and thoroughly documented testimony, printed in the June 1 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, without concluding that the proposed increase is indispensable to our common goal of keeping faith with our wounded veterans.

We all recognize the serious problem of inflation and the compelling need to keep Government spending at the lowest levels that can be justified.

But it would be ironic if, in the name of fighting inflation, we denied adequate care to the brave men who were maimed in fighting the very war that is the principal cause of the inflation.

It is a matter of the national conscience. I respectfully urge our colleagues on the conference committee to stand firm on the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations which, I am confident, is to be the decision of the Senate.

I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from California once again for yielding for these comments and to compliment him for the helpful work he did in the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to bring to the attention of the American people these facts.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the Senator from Iowa very much for his staunch work on the Veterans' Affairs Subcom-

mittee, and for his support, at this moment when the \$100 million figure is of such great significance to the fulfillment of the effort that we have undertaken.

In my original statement before the Appropriations Subcommittee of which the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) is chairman, I did talk in terms of \$174 million for the purposes for which this lesser sum has now been recommended. I am satisfied that with the \$100 million, we can accomplish a great part, or begin to accomplish a great part, of what needs to be done; and I, therefore, against stress that that figure is a highly satisfactory one, and I am very grateful to the committee.

I now yield with pleasure to the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON).

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California.

I support the Appropriations Committee amendment to H.R. 17548 which adds \$100 million to the amount appropriated by the House for medical care and construction for Veterans' Administration Hospitals. I want to commend the members of the Appropriations Committee, and especially the subcommittee chairman, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) for acting to meet the well-demonstrated needs of Veterans' Hospitals for additional funds.

This is a very substantial sum to add to the bill, but I believe that it is important to recognize that this addition represents, in large part, the price we must pay for having postponed necessary expenditures in past years. If we are to avoid continued deterioration of the VA hospital system, we must be prepared to appropriate the sums required for the kind of care of which, I am sure all would agree, veterans are deserving.

The gradual deterioration of the VA hospital system has been amply demonstrated through the painstaking investigation conducted by the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON). This investigation brought to light the results of a process of deferring needed expenditures for provision of equipment and supplies, construction and renovation of facilities, and most important, failure to acquire new staff and replace staff members lost through attrition.

I want to join in the theme which runs through Senator CRANSTON's statements on the subject, that we must look upon the cost of veterans' programs, including the cost of providing first-rate medical care, as a part of the cost of war. For too long the VA hospitals have been funded as if there had been no war in Vietnam and as if there were no inflation constantly inflating costs.

The appropriations recommended in this bill will go a long way toward correcting the results of inadequate funding in the past. I pledge my support to the amounts recommended by the Appropriations Committee and I want to express my hope that the amounts in the Senate bill will emerge from conference as the amounts in the final bill approved by both Houses.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the Senator from Missouri very much for his very constructive comments, and for his support. It is very useful to have him join with others in this effort to assure that we do finally get the funds appropriated for the Veterans' Administration that have now been recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I now with pleasure yield the floor back to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, with deep appreciation for his helpfulness.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), who I think did a fine service for the veterans with the investigation he conducted. I think he has brought this whole matter into proper focus; but I think we ought to say at this juncture that no American, whether he be a Member of Congress or outside Congress, ever intentionally, I am sure, did anything but the right thing for our veterans.

I have been in the Senate now for 20 years. I went all through the Korean aftermath, and now we have Vietnam. It is true that we are experiencing kinds of injuries today that were never thought of before, in previous wars. It is a very pathetic thing. Some of our veterans in wheelchairs cannot even light their own cigarettes. Sometimes it is only a question of having someone push a wheelchair to the window so that the patient can look outside and see the sunshine, which he cannot do without assistance. But the veterans' hospitals, like all our other hospitals, have been plagued with the difficulty of recruitment, finding the right people to do the right kind of job. That has really been their trouble.

They have taken the position before our committee that it was not so much a question of the money as of difficulty in getting some of these people. I have been one of those most critical of the fact that sometimes they have taken paraplegic cases to hospitals in areas other than hospitals where I thought recruitment would be a lot easier. But then you get down to the question of whether or not to move the veteran from his indigenous environment, and that raises another big question.

But we are appropriating \$1,857,200,000 for medical care—the largest figure in the history of the country. Of course, we have more wounded veterans today than we have ever had before.

All of us on the committee, after we heard Senator CRANSTON, felt that if there was any question of doubt as to what we should do, the doubt should be resolved in favor of the veteran. That is exactly what we did. I want to say at this moment that Mr. Donald E. Johnson, the Veterans' Administrator today, and formerly the national commander of the American Legion, is a dedicated and devoted man, and I think he wants to do everything possible to see that the veterans get the best.

I say that we would not be doing our duty if we did not give our veterans, their widows, and their children the best possible care and the best possible attention that America can give. We have spent billions and billions of dollars to rehabilitate nations throughout the en-

tire world, whether they were our friends, our allies, or our foes in war. We lifted them from their knees. We gave them full stature and full dignity; and I think we ought to do the same for our veterans. I do not think there is any Senator who would want to do otherwise.

I thank my colleague from California, who did such a marvelous job.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. CRANSTON. Just very briefly, I again thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island and the distinguished Senator from Colorado for their understanding of this problem, and for their support. I do want to say, in respect to two of the comments just made by the Senator from Rhode Island, that first, I know that Mr. Johnson and others in the Veterans' Administration feel exactly the way the Senator from Rhode Island says they do. They wish to do all that is possible for the veterans. They are dedicated to giving them the best possible service and care; and were it not for the fact that they are, under the budget, constrained from higher prices in this administration, they would, I think, be able to do more and to express more their concern and their need for funds.

With regard to the recruiting problem the Senator from Rhode Island touched upon, a survey of the heads of veterans hospitals around the country in regard to their need for personnel and their ability to find the necessary personnel in the local community indicated they could locate and hire about 90 percent of what they needed, were they allocated the sort of funds we now propose to appropriate for that purpose.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I would just like to add a word on this subject, because I feel, as I think most of us feel, particularly those of us who have been in the armed services at one time or another, that we owe a special obligation to our men who have represented this country in the military and who, by reason thereof, are injured or hurt, or are sick, and need help.

But I think there is one other factor in this matter that I did not hear the chairman speak of, and that is that in some of these instances there is not only the question of not moving a veteran out of his indigenous surroundings, that is, what would generally be considered his home area, but in many cases it would mean also moving them away from the highly specialized medical men and women who can give them the assistance they need.

Strangely enough, it is just in such places that the kind of personnel which we have been discussing, which the Senator from California and the distinguished chairman talked about, the ordinary personnel needed to care for these people, are hardest to get. In many of our hospitals, I think probably, the care would be much easier to get, but these are not necessarily the best places, because of the location of their homes and because of medical expertise and surgical expertise, that you have to put these men.

So I want to pay a compliment to the Administrator. I think he is doing a

wonderful job. I think the additional money we have put in this bill at the insistence of the Senator from California will go a long way toward assuring us that these men are given all the aid, assistance, and comfort we can give them. It is a small and partial repayment—it is very small; it is paltry—with respect to what they have given up for us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) on the effective work he is doing in behalf of our Nation's veterans.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee and chairman of the Supplemental Appropriations Subcommittee, I have become increasingly concerned about conditions in VA hospitals. I enthusiastically agreed to the administration's request for \$15 million more in the supplemental bill for the fiscal year 1970 for VA medical care and agreed to the \$7 million more for this purpose added in the other body, a total of \$22 million.

Now, for fiscal year 1971, the Appropriations Committee has followed up on these fiscal year 1970 supplemental appropriations just signed into law by adding \$100 million above the House-passed level. And the House had already added \$25 million above the administration amended budget request.

This additional \$125 million should allow substantial improvements in our veterans' hospitals. The medical care we provided our wounded veterans must be first quality, and I believe we have done our duty to insure this by the Appropriations Committee's proposed increase. I strongly support this increase and urge my colleagues to approve the recommendation.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the veterans' hospitals in our Nation have done an outstanding job in attempting to meet the needs of medical care for our wounded servicemen. Regrettably, our Nation has failed to provide adequate medical care to the thousands and thousands of veterans who are entitled to the best care possible. The tragedies related to the Vietnam war have increased the demand and, in far too many instances, our servicemen who made such sacrifices are receiving second rate medical care. It is ironic that a Nation whose military technology has developed the most sophisticated resources to wage war is failing to devote the same energy and resources to medical care for the men who have fought in our armed conflicts.

The \$100 million increase recommended for the medical and hospital appropriation categories to the Veterans' Administration appropriation will provide significant improvement on the quality of care in our veterans' hospitals throughout the Nation.

I believe it is incumbent upon the Congress to provide medical care that is second to none for our Nation's sick and disabled veterans. This is especially true at a time when the veteran population of our Nation is rapidly expanding by the separation of disabled veterans from the

Vietnam conflict. Although I strongly advocate Congress taking steps to curb inflation by the reduction of Government spending, I cannot agree that this is an area where we should make cuts in the name of sound fiscal policy. These veterans deserve the best attention and treatment that this Nation can provide, and I urge that we support the increases recommended by the Senate and stand fast on this figure in conference.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong support for the action taken by the Committee on Appropriations with regard to Veterans' Administration medical funds in this bill.

The committee has recognized the urgent needs of our 166 Veterans' Administration hospitals for more staffing, more equipment, and more facilities to do their critical task. As a result, the committee, in this bill, recommends \$100 million more for the Veterans' Administration medical program than was allowed in the House-passed version of H.R. 17548.

This increase breaks down as follows: for medical care, the committee provides \$1,857,200,000 which is \$80 million above the House figure. For hospital construction, the committee provides \$79 million, which is \$20 million above the House figure.

I would like to commend especially the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the chairman of the subcommittee writing this bill, for his judgment and foresight on this matter. I know that he will have the support of the entire Senate when he takes this bill to conference and works to keep these higher figures in the final bill.

As ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have been particularly close to the problems being faced by the veterans' hospitals.

Under the dynamic and tireless leadership of the subcommittee chairman, the able Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), our subcommittee began last November to investigate the status of medical care in veterans' hospitals for returning Vietnam veterans. We have held extensive hearings and the public spotlight has focused on some of the severe shortages in staff, equipment, and facilities. Finally, in this appropriations measure now before us, we can see some tangible results of our subcommittee's work in bringing the attention of the Senate and the public to bear on these areas of critical need in the veterans' medical care program.

The Nixon administration, to its great credit, has moved ahead dramatically on its own in the past year to rectify conditions in the hospitals brought on by years of relative neglect. One year ago Donald Johnson took office as Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and was immediately directed by President Nixon to conduct a thorough review of the VA medical program. One result was the administration's budget request for this program for this year of \$1,811,200,000 in medical care and construction funds. This was a record amount for a budget

request and it was nearly \$87 million more than what Congress appropriated in fiscal year 1970.

The President, it is clear, shares the wish of Congress that our veterans shall have the very best in medical care, as is only just, in view of the great personal sacrifices these men have made for a grateful Nation.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I congratulate the Committee on Appropriations for seeing the urgent necessity for additional funds for the VA hospital program. I know that the action the committee has taken will be overwhelmingly approved by the Senate, and that, above all, the American people will also overwhelmingly approve what we do here for our veterans.

CONGRESS RESPONDS TO THE NEEDS OF AMERICA'S WOUNDED VETERANS

Mr. YARBROUGH. Mr. President, in recent months the conscience of America has been awakened to the pitiful plight of our wounded and disabled veterans who are depending on the Veterans' Administration medical and hospital programs to assist them in regaining some measure of their health. The investigation conducted by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, under the able leadership of Senator ALAN CRANSTON, revealed to a startled Nation that the standard of care in many of the 166 VA hospitals and 202 out-patient clinics has steadily degenerated during the last few years until it has reached the point of being a national disgrace. The reason for the decline in veterans' hospital and medical care programs is quite clear. The administration and its budget officers have failed to request sufficient funds to meet the ever-increasing patient load that has been imposed on the Veterans' Administration health facilities as a result of the Indochina war.

From 1961 to June of this year, over 141,000 of our servicemen have sustained wounds of such severity that they have required hospitalization. Despite the increased responsibilities for the care and treatment of these wounded veterans imposed upon the Veterans' Administration, the budget for these important medical and hospital programs has not been sufficient to allow the Veterans' Administration to provide these veterans with the first-class care they so justly deserve. As a result, thousands of wounded and disabled veterans have been confined in hospitals and clinics that are understaffed, unclean, and outmoded. This is a sin on our public conscience and we cannot allow these deplorable conditions to continue.

Once these facts were brought to the attention of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, Senator CRANSTON urged the Subcommittee on Appropriations to increase the funds for Veterans' Administration hospital and medical care by at least \$174 million to improve the hospital and medical care for veterans. I have supported this request both as a member of the Appropriations Committee, as senior member of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, and as chairman

of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

The distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, Senator PASTORE, responded to the urgent need for an increase in funds for Veterans' Administration medical and hospital programs and his subcommittee, together with the other members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, increased the funds for these vital programs by \$100,000. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I know the great responsibilities that the Subcommittee on Independent Offices must meet; therefore, I commend Senator PASTORE and the members of his subcommittee on their action in increasing this appropriation. I strongly urge them to stand firm on this matter in conference.

This increase in funds will be of great benefit to the over 1,370,000 veterans in Texas. The nine Texas Veterans' Administration hospitals have the following deficiencies:

The Dallas Veterans' Administration hospital is short 65 staff positions and needs an additional \$260,000 for drugs and other medical and dental supplies;

The Houston Veterans' Administration hospital needs funds to staff over 200 positions in the hospital and over \$900,000 for medical and dental supplies;

The Amarillo Veterans' Administration hospital may have to divert \$19,000 from much needed repair work to pay for the staff;

The Bonham Veterans' Administration hospital needs an additional \$60,000 for staff and \$40,000 for hospital operation;

The Kerrville Veterans' Administration has an urgent need for \$77,000 for its community nursing home program;

The Marlin Veterans' Administration hospital needs \$11,600 to purchase a fluoroscopic image intensifier which is required for X-ray work;

The Big Spring Veterans' Administration hospital has a need for \$90,000 for its community nursing home program; and

The Temple Veterans' Administration hospital needs approximately \$216,500 to meet increased staff and operational demands.

I am pleased that the administration has released the funds to begin the air-conditioning of the Waco Veterans' Administration hospital and the funds to begin the construction of the much needed San Antonio Veterans' Administration hospital during this fiscal year.

In addition to these inadequacies, there are no funds provided in the present budget for air-conditioning the Amarillo, Temple, or Kerrville Veterans' Administration hospitals. It is a disgrace in this age of technical progress to confine American fighting men to hospitals that are hot in a hot summer.

Mr. President, the veterans of America owe a debt of gratitude to Senator CRANSTON and Senator PASTORE for their concern for their health and well-being. I wish again to express my strong support for these additional funds and urge the Senate conferees to not retreat 1 inch from the position taken by the Senate on this important matter. It is

the least we can do for those who have given so much for our country.

VETERANS' CARE—AT THE TOP OF OUR PRIORITIES

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, there are many needs our Nation must meet, but at the top of any listing of priorities must come the best possible medical care for our veterans.

Along with the leaders of our great veterans organizations—the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, AM-VETS, and others—I urge in the strongest possible terms that we do not relax in the slightest our vigilance in the care of those who served this Nation in the Armed Forces.

I support the dedicated efforts of my colleagues such as my friend the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) chairman of the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, the most able Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee which handles Veterans' Administration funds, and the many others who have joined in diligently developing this legislation.

Veterans have a special place in the order of appreciated citizens. In most instances, they have given the best years of their lives to serve this country. And many have given not only their time in service—but their physical well-being as well.

Now our Nation is engaged in a war in which deaths from casualties are blessedly fewer than in previous wars. But while the death rate has fallen, the rate of permanent and disabling wounds has risen sharply.

Servicemen are being crippled in Vietnam at twice the rate of Korea and three times the rate of World War II.

This means, of course, that while fewer die in battle, more will require constant, competent medical care for nonfatal wounds and injuries.

What is disturbing, Mr. President, are recent studies by the House Veterans Affairs Committee, by committees of the Senate, and evaluations by the media and veterans organizations which make it clear that our Nation is not providing veterans with the care they deserve.

Under an ever-increasing workload, our veterans' hospitals must function with half the staff, proportionately, of other hospitals.

This year the VA medical program has been operating with fewer full-time permanent staff positions than 5 years ago. Yet 30,000 more veterans require care today than required it 5 years ago.

But let me quickly make it clear that I am criticizing neither veterans' hospitals nor staffs for this situation. They are doing, in most instances, the best they can under difficult circumstances.

I was deeply concerned when the administration failed to propose adequate funds for VA medical care in the budget it presented in January. And even though the administration did ask for an additional \$50 million—shortly after the House Veterans Affairs Committee turned up further instances of serious VA medical care deficiencies, the additional funds asked still fall far short of hospital needs.

The House saw fit to recommend an

additional \$25 million in the legislation sent to the Senate, and I am most pleased that the Senate is considering a further increase of \$100 million.

Mr. President, this increase will go a long way toward providing the kind of care we must assure our veterans. While it is still the minimum addition we can consider, I support it with enthusiasm because it is a step forward and will give us a stronger base on which to build for the future.

I urge that the Senate conferees who will be meeting with Members of the House to resolve differences between the Senate- and House-passed bills will stand firm for these increased funds which are so vitally needed.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, in recent months a great deal of attention has been focused on a particularly distressing problem, the lack of adequate care for veterans in this country. There have been shocking reports and photographs of Veterans' Administration hospitals whose dire conditions seem impossible in this time of advanced technology, expertise, and modern medical equipment. Under the leadership of the able Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs has extensively investigated conditions in VA hospitals throughout the country. Its findings have underlined the immediate need for increased staffing, modernized surroundings, additional space and increased research and teaching space, so that every veteran will receive the proper treatment he may need and to which he is entitled.

We have a dedicated staff at the VA hospital in Togus, Maine. The Togus staff does an admirable job in administering to the needs of Maine veterans. However, improvements need to be made, for both the present and future needs of veterans. Although veterans with service-connected disabilities are being treated promptly, there is a considerable waiting list for veterans who have non-service-connected problems. Additional nursing care is needed, as well as additional construction and more technical specialists. At least two more psychiatrists are needed, and there is no neurosurgeon in residence. It is estimated that about \$250,000 could be spent to alleviate backlogs, increase staffing and improve the overall functioning of the hospital.

I strongly support, and urge others to support, the increased appropriations of \$100 million for VA appropriations contained in the Senate version of H.R. 17548, which the Appropriations Committee reported on June 24. This increase of \$100 million is the minimum required to begin to meet the needs of our veterans. It will not erase the problems that exist, but it is a vital step towards insuring every veteran in this country of adequate medical care to which he is entitled.

Mr. President, our veterans deserve the best medical care this country can offer. The increase of \$100 million in VA appropriations is a necessity and one that must be passed to meet the needs of all eligible veterans.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I join the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) in strongly urging the Senate to enact the Appropriations Committee's

recommendations for the 1971 Veterans' Administration budget. I am convinced that the \$100 million addition to the House-passed bill represents the minimal allocation which effectively will halt deterioration of VA hospitals and will secure measurable improvements in hospital conditions.

The fundamental objective of the Veterans' Administration medical program is to provide the best medical care possible for American veterans. Members of the 5,000-man VA research team have pioneered medical techniques which have made outstanding contributions to medicine. In addition to training more health personnel than any other medical institution in the world, the VA medical program facilitates the rapid dissemination of current medical knowledge.

One additional point should be emphasized: the VA medical program has always provided American veterans with excellent medical care in view of severe fiscal restrictions.

Mr. President, we must now exercise fiscal responsibility by appropriating adequate funds which are requisite to providing the best medical care possible.

For the past 8 months, conditions at VA hospitals have been subjected to a thorough investigation by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, chaired by the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON). These hearings indicate that the VA medical program has been denied reasonable operating funds. Regressive budgets have restricted the expansion of VA research projects, and have accelerated the deterioration of medical facilities.

The principal deficiency of the VA medical program is a shortage of staff members. Personnel-patient ratios at national community hospitals stand at 2.7 to 1; at university hospitals, they climb to between 3.5 and 4 to 1. The ratio for VA hospitals is a meager 1.5 to 1. The Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968, in its blanket application to Federal employees, pushed VA staff employment back to the July 1966 level. Testimony before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs indicates that as an unfortunate consequence, the VA hospitals presently find themselves short 10,000 staff members.

Budgetary limitations have resulted in the repeated deferment of the replacement of aging equipment. One witness who testified before the subcommittee documented the case of a VA hospital where X-ray facilities were, "obsolete, in the worst sense of the word." Forty-three VA hospitals—including those in Amarillo, Tex., Fayetteville, Ark., and Gulfport, Miss.—have no air-conditioning units. In one Tennessee VA hospital, a \$500,000 intensive care unit and a \$200,000 cardiac treatment unit are idle for lack of funds. Furthermore, hospital directors understandably have diverted funds from equipment purchases and hospital construction in order to hire and pay desperately needed personnel.

One-half of the VA hospital beds are occupied by psychiatric patients. The psychological trauma afflicting disabled veterans of the Vietnam war far sur-

passes the mental tensions caused by any previous war. Many men who have sustained spinal cord injuries and others who have required the amputation of two or three limbs, have survived this war where they would have died previously. The "wounded to kill ratio" is understandably higher than that in prior wars since helicopter evacuation techniques allow a man to be transported in less than 40 minutes' time from the battlefield to a nearby Army hospital, where pharmaceutical knowledge and surgical skills have been vastly updated. The increasing incidence of total disability among veterans, compounded by the belief of many veterans that their sacrifices were in vain, has bred widespread mental disorders.

VA psychiatrists battle these mental diseases with a limited array of medical weapons. The ratio of psychiatrists to psychiatric patients at VA hospitals is incredibly low: one psychiatrist for every 535 patients. In community hospitals, the figure is a much more reasonable one, one psychiatrist for every 25 patients. As a consequence of the crowded VA psychiatric wards, psychiatrists are allowed, on the average, only 4½ minutes per patient per week. There are now twice as many psychiatric admissions to VA hospitals as there were in 1964, with a psychiatric staff which is only half as large.

Other common disabilities include spinal cord injuries, which afflict 25 percent of the wounded veterans returning from Vietnam, an astonishing increase from the Korean war and World War II figures—6.9 and 3.13 percent. VA medical facilities have proven to be incapable of guaranteeing optimal medical attention. The staff-patient ratio stands at 1.02 employees per patient, while Dr. Howard Rusk, of the Institute of Rehabilitative Medicine in New York, indicates that even with the advanced equipment and therapeutic techniques available in the institute, outstanding patient care requires a ratio of 2.17 to 1, or better than twice the VA figure. Testimony indicates that many patients, who have become greatly demoralized by the irregular attention that they receive, have lost the incentive to participate in vital therapeutic programs. Because paralyzed veterans are highly susceptible to bladder and kidney disorders, for them the distinction between good health and serious illness is often very minute. Constant medical care is imperative for the maximum safety of these patients.

These deficiencies comprise a few of the prominent problems which occur in the VA hospital system. In order to insure that American veterans receive the highest quality medical care possible, these numerous inadequacies must be alleviated.

Mr. President, medical care and attention for American veterans which is consistent with current advances in medical knowledge will become a reality only after the VA medical program is adequately funded.

The Senator from California has conservatively estimated that the Veterans' Administration medical program needs

\$174 million in addition to the House-passed budget of \$1.777 billion. He has concluded that to bring staff ratios to a reasonable level would require \$200 million; and yet he recommended only \$51 million, a compromise figure which is intended to allow the hiring of an additional 5,000 personnel. Backlogs for necessary equipment purchases total more than \$40 million, and a \$17 million increase in the research budget would have only brought it to the level suggested by the Department of Medicine and Surgery for the 1970 fiscal year. The \$19 million for hospital and domiciliary construction and renovation was warranted by the continual deferral of construction in favor of paying salaries to health personnel.

If the budget were to remain at the level agreed upon in the House, its 7.5-percent increase over the past fiscal year would render it, at best, a status quo budget, granting only negligible improvements in conditions at VA hospitals. Testimony indicates that shortages of funds will compel administrators to weigh the quality of medical services against the quantity of people to whom these services may be provided. Because they refuse to lower their standards below designated requirements set by health agencies, they must close wards as their only alternative. The \$100 million compromise recommended by the Appropriations Committee—which represents only 57 percent of the amount which the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs found to be desperately needed—is essential in its entirety if significant improvements in the VA medical program are to be realized. The steady erosion of VA programs must be halted before the foundation of the hospital system collapses.

Several critical VA programs have been neglected because of the funding crisis. One way to improve medical care at VA hospitals would be to intensify and expand affiliations between VA hospitals and medical schools. However, valuable programs between medical schools and VA hospitals are dependent upon the assumption that facilities and equipment are comparable in each of the institutions. The results of a study which were submitted to the subcommittee indicate that at a university or university affiliated hospital, only 14 percent of the patients receive less than optimal care. At a nonaffiliated hospital with a residence training program, the study noted that 45 percent of the patients receive less than optimal care, and in proprietary hospitals, that percentage reaches 57 percent. Clearly, a direct correlation exists between the quality of patient care, and training programs which incorporate medical school students. Presently, 94 VA hospitals are affiliated with 80 medical schools, and 39,000 health professionals—20 percent of all physicians and 50 percent of all medical students—receive some VA training.

In order to attract top faculty members to a VA hospital staff, the hospital must have outstanding training and research facilities. The patients in such a hospital then become double beneficiaries. They receive expert medical at-

tention from outstanding physicians, plus the fringe benefit of being attended by the best interns and residents, who naturally follow the outstanding instructors. In order to obtain such high caliber personnel, the VA hospitals must bolster their research programs and must have competitive wage scales—neither of which is possible without increased appropriations.

Mr. President, throughout America, hospitals are plagued by a nationwide shortage of health personnel. Testimony before the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs indicates that approximately 9,000 more dentists, 50,000 additional physicians, 145,000 nurses, and 200,000 more allied health professionals are needed in order to adequately satisfy the current national demand for health manpower.

These shortages have been catastrophic for the VA Medical Program. Due to fiscal limitations, salaries of VA health personnel are not competitive with earnings of other professionals in the medical industry. Consequently, VA hospital directors cannot recruit the necessary personnel, and outstanding members of the VA staff often search for more lucrative opportunities elsewhere. Unless salary scales are increased, those medical students with the highest qualifications will not seek employment with the VA, and if the VA is unable to employ the best health professionals, it will also be incapable of providing the best medical care possible.

This problem will not be alleviated by appropriating funds for an additional 5,000 employees at present salary scales. Instead, VA salary scales at every level must be raised in order to compete with earning potentials offered by community and proprietary hospitals. Once reasonable salary bases are secured, additional funds must be appropriated in order to hire additional employees. But to appropriate funds for more staff members at present wage levels is an exercise in futility. It is unlikely that the 1971 6 percent pay increase for VA employees will appreciably increase the size of the VA hospital staffs this fiscal year. Substantial additions to VA staffs will not be made until wage increases make salaries for VA personnel truly competitive.

Another alternative which must be explored is the correlation of medical training which men receive in the Armed Forces with requirements for licensing health professionals. Army medics are currently unable to practice medical skills which they have acquired in the military even though they may be qualified to assist a physician in a limited capacity. One way to relieve the shortage of allied health professionals would be to intensify the training of military medical corpsmen and to make medical licensing requirements compatible with the training they receive. This is not to suggest that qualifications for medical practice should be relaxed. Rather, it means that the skills of men who are qualified must be utilized in order to reduce health personnel shortages.

Mr. President, as we examine the strengths and the weaknesses of the VA hospital system and identify those alternatives and programs which are

necessary to rectify deficiencies in the program, we must remind ourselves of our obligations to American veterans.

We must recognize that American youth, whether they are drafted or they enlist, are introduced to a new life style when they enter the Armed Forces. Civilian attitudes and habits are incompatible with the rigorous demands of military discipline. Special training and instruction helps them adapt to military life. Conversely, when these men reenter civilian life, they inevitably find that they must make major readjustments if they are to become constructive members of society. As fellow Americans, it is our responsibility to help these men to overcome transitional problems in moving from the military to civilian life, just as we were obliged to provide them with training programs enabling them to adjust to the Armed Forces when they left civilian life. And though it be some small solace, we must guarantee the best medical care and rehabilitative opportunities possible to our disabled veterans, who have made innumerable sacrifices to preserve this Nation.

And yet, Mr. President, the entire fiscal budget for the VA medical program is roughly equivalent to the cost of 1 month of fighting in Vietnam. Paradoxically, the gradual degeneration of VA facilities has been accelerated by the war economy. This war economy has stimulated inflation, which has had drastic effects upon hospitalization programs. With full cognizance of the soaring medical expenses of VA programs, the Federal Government has attempted to retard inflation by shackling the VA to regressive budgets. The natural effect upon the VA hospital system is not to reduce the cost of services, but to instead reduce the number of medical services made available at higher costs.

A standstill budget has restricted research programs which have historically led the medical field in implementing experimental techniques and equipment. A high premium must be placed upon the contributions of research. Allocations which are designated for research projects cannot be reduced because more moneys are required to hire and pay additional personnel.

A few of the many attributes of the VA's research program, which is the largest of its kind in the world, include: the world's most advanced program for the study of mental disease, the development of the Pacemaker, a mechanism which combats heart disease by regulating the heartbeat, projects to investigate the value of the laser beam in surgery, the development of the artificial kidney, the employment of radio isotopes in medical prognosis, the utilization of a computer in the detection of heart disease, the use of surgery as a treatment for cancer, and many other worthwhile programs.

When these research programs decay, top VA scientists search for new research opportunities elsewhere. This destroys the quality of the VA hospital system, and also impedes the advancement of medical knowledge.

One final principle which the Senator from California has articulated must be reemphasized: the cost of providing American veterans with high quality

medical attention, equitable educational and vocational opportunities, and reasonable compensation for disability, must be classified as a basic cost of war. Funds are lavishly spent in equipping a man with the weapons of war, and in instructing him in the military way of life. Our attention must instead be focused on enabling American veterans to readjust easily in making the transition from military to civilian life.

Mr. President, the prolonged deterioration of VA facilities and the retardation of VA programs will irreparably stigmatize the VA medical program. The broken morale of a dedicated staff will make the VA objective of providing the best possible medical care for American veterans an illusory goal.

Once again, Mr. President, I must strongly endorse the Appropriations Committee's recommendation for adding \$100 million to the House-passed VA budget. I have been informed that in my State of Oregon, this could tentatively mean an additional \$1,054,700 to be divided in the following fashion:

Purpose:	Amount
Additional general medical care personnel	\$198,200
Elimination of equipment, maintenance, and repair backlog	761,400
Elimination of dental case backlog	60,000
Allied health and intensive care training	35,000
Total	1,054,700

These funds are critically important to the two VA hospitals in Oregon. Without these additional appropriations, the expansion of existing programs and the substantive improvement of medical services will be severely limited.

The recommendations of the Appropriations Committee culminate 8 months of research and six sessions of hearings held by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs. The subcommittee has documented the deficiencies of the program, and has concluded that substantially increased appropriations are necessary in order to improve medical services and programs. The \$100-million addition to the House-passed budget must be retained in its entirety, research programs must be expanded, salary levels must be made competitive, and qualified health personnel must be licensed if the deterioration of the VA medical program is to be halted, and if first class medical care is to be provided to American veterans.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I support the efforts of the junior Senator from California, the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, to increase the Veterans' Administration appropriation for 1971 by \$100 million.

As a veteran who spent more than 3 years in Army hospitals after World War II, I understand the meaning of good medical care to the morale of a soldier in the field. The 166 Veterans' Administration hospitals have symbolized our concern for the well-being of American men injured in combat. These hospitals have in the past performed admirably, giving our wounded men the very best in medical care and pioneering the advancement of many fields of medicine.

With the Vietnam era, and especially in the last several years, new variables have begun to tax the VA system beyond its capacities. The nature of the war itself is different from World War II or the Korean war, and so is the medical technology available to aid our men in the field. The result is that far more men are surviving injuries in Vietnam—but surviving at a terrible price. A higher proportion of disabled veterans come back to this country blinded, paralyzed, as amputees, or with multiple injuries than in any other war we have ever fought. The bulk of the VA hospital system was built in another era for another war; it was not designed to handle the new strains introduced by the Vietnam war.

I join my colleagues in commending the Veterans' Administration for its efforts on behalf of the men it serves, and would add a word of thanks and appreciation to the 135,000 dedicated VA hospital employees who are doing their best in the face of some very serious practical difficulties. It is clearly time to give the VA hospitals more assistance. It is time to restore them to a preeminent position within America's hospital systems.

We have never skimped on providing funds for the VA. The Nixon administration, like all its predecessors, has sought to provide additional funds when the need arose; however, general Federal budget limitations have in recent years restricted the availability of funds for improving and expanding VA facilities and programs. Only 3 months ago the President proposed a substantial increase in the VA appropriation for fiscal year 1971, and at the same time he requested \$15 million as a supplemental appropriation for the remaining part of fiscal year 1970 which has just ended.

Now, more than ever, we must assure the continued high morale of our forces overseas. We must provide our combat casualties, not with merely adequate care, but with the very best medical care available.

I endorse the Appropriations Committee's amendment increasing the VA medical and hospital program by \$100 million for fiscal 1971, and I urge the Senate to adopt it. I hope the Senate conferees will hold firm on this \$100 million figure and, when appropriated, the VA will be allotted these funds as soon as possible.

As I said on the floor of the Senate in April:

More money in VA's medical program is an investment that strengthens our Nation and helps all citizens—veterans and nonveterans.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, we have spent long hours in recent years debating the wisdom of our country's military commitments in Vietnam and in the world.

However, the doubt which I and others have expressed regarding the value of those military commitments should in no way indicate a lack of commitment to the men who must meet those military commitments.

Our military men deserve our full sup-

port. They deserve our support not only in battle, but they deserve our support here at home where many of them have returned either crippled or injured.

It is in recognition of this commitment that I support the increased appropriations for the Veterans' Administration that have been recommended by my able colleague from Rhode Island, Senator PASTORE, and congratulate him on his action in this regard.

With the additional \$100 million that Senator PASTORE has provided, many of the funding shortages which Senator CRANSTON has brought to the Senate's attention in his recent hearings can be eliminated.

I have recently visited the Veterans' Hospital in my own State of Rhode Island where I found a very clean hospital. Also, I had the chance to chat with about half the patients there who almost invariably told me that they felt they were being cared for with concern and compassion. Nevertheless, the ratio of medical personnel in proportion to patients is less than is the case of civilian hospitals and far more support is needed. For this reason, I am delighted to learn that, with the increases made by Senator PASTORE, the Providence Veterans' Hospital can be expected to receive an additional \$311,500 in this fiscal year.

I would hope that the Senate would support this increase recommended by the Appropriations Committee and I would further ask that our Senate conferees stand firm in their defense of this increase.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, all Senators have followed with great concern the efforts of the able chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, Mr. CRANSTON, to present the full facts surrounding the quality of medical care available at our Veterans' Administration medical centers. The subcommittee findings, based on 6 months of hearings, were submitted to the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee in support of a significantly increased funding level for the VA hospital and medical care program.

In the years I have been privileged to serve in the Senate, I have seldom seen a more meticulously documented case for the necessity of providing additional resources to permit a Federal program to discharge the responsibilities with which it is charged.

Budgetary restraint is required in an inflationary era such as the present. However, regardless of how we may differ as to other programs that should be cut, I would hope there is unanimous support for the goal of providing our veterans the unexcelled medical care to which they are entitled. At the base of our inflationary spiral is the enormous cost of our Southeast Asia commitment. Surely we cannot ask the returning Vietnam veterans, who have already paid the highest human cost of this war, to accept less than the best possible medical care.

Through the enlightened leadership of Chairman PASTORE of the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, the bill we consider today (H.R. 17548)

contains an additional \$100 million for the VA medical and hospital care program. While this is a substantial increase over the budget request and amount provided in the House bill, it is clear that the need is great, indeed.

I would strongly urge that these additional funds be retained in the bill that emerges from the House-Senate conference on H.R. 17548.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, unfortunately, the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) is unable to be in attendance today due to a longstanding engagement away from Washington. He has requested that, in his absence, I submit for the RECORD his statement in support of the \$100 million in additional funds granted by the Senate Appropriations Committee for use by the Veterans' Administration. I ask unanimous consent that his prepared remarks, as well as those of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), together with an insertion; the prepared remarks of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE); and the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS); the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS); all of whom are necessarily absent today, appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements and insertion were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. CHURCH

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, earlier this year the state of Idaho was honored to have as a visitor the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. Cranston). While he was in our state, he and I toured the Veterans Administration facility in Boise, the capital city of Idaho.

The Idaho facility, fortunately, has managed, despite funding problems and personnel shortages, to maintain a high standard of care for returning veterans. It has largely been due to the hard-working and dedicated staff and administration in the Boise facility that the standard of care has been maintained under difficult conditions. For that the Idaho facility is to be commended. Unfortunately, however, in many of our larger VA centers, inadequate funding and serious personnel shortages have reduced the quality of care to second or third-rate status. Some have even described conditions as "medieval."

It is my feeling, Mr. President, and I know it is a feeling shared by every member of this body that, regardless of our respective beliefs regarding the war in Vietnam, there can be no doubt as to the necessity of providing the highest possible level of medical care to those men who have become the victims of the tragic war in Southeast Asia.

The Junior Senator from California has done an outstanding job in his efforts to assure our Vietnam veterans high quality medical care. In hearings which began in November of last year and stretched into April of 1970, Senator Cranston examined in depth the needs of our VA facilities. Upon the conclusion of these in-depth hearings, where shocking deficiencies were revealed in the care provided in some VA centers, Senator Cranston went to the Senate Appropriations Committee and carefully documented his case. At that time, he requested an additional \$189 million for the Veterans Administration. The Committee has agreed to grant an additional \$100 million for the VA, largely as a result of the efforts of Senator Cranston. Senator Cranston has my full support in his efforts to gain more funds

for our veterans hospitals and the Committee has my full support in its action granting an additional \$100 million for the VA.

The increase granted by the committee could result in a total of \$77,500 in increased allocations to Idaho which could be used in the following ways: \$51,400 could be utilized to hire additional general medical care personnel, \$21,000 could be used to eliminate dental case backlogs, and \$51,000 could be made available for allied health and intensive care training.

Mr. President, it is a tragic but all too obvious fact that our nation is at war in Asia. It is equally true that the very nature of this guerrilla war produces a large number of seriously injured veterans who need the finest we can provide in medical care when they return to the United States.

Mr. President, I first spoke out against the war in Vietnam in 1963. I have opposed this war; I have advised against it; I have tried to do everything in my power, as one Senator, to end it. However, Mr. President, I have also supported every appropriation to come before the Senate to provide the best of material to our men in the field. Once our men are there we must provide the best that money can offer until such time as we may bring them home. Just as I have supported all bills to grant aid to our men in the field, I intend to support legislation, such as the bill before this body today, which will grant them the finest in care when they return home with medical needs. It is our duty to provide the finest in medical care to our Vietnam veterans. I strongly support the Senator from California (Mr. Cranston) and the committee in their efforts to obtain more funds for the quality care of American boys who are wounded, either medically or psychologically, by the war in Vietnam.

STATEMENT BY MR. HART

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I want to add my support—my strong support—for the \$125 million the Senate Appropriations Committee recommends over the budget request for Veterans Administration medical care programs.

On June 11, I wrote a letter to Senator Pastore, Chairman of the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, urging that more than \$150 million be added to the budget request.

That request was based on three points.

First, the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, under the outstanding leadership of Senator Cranston, investigated the quality of health care in VA facilities and came up with a detailed list of recommendations for additional funds.

Second, James L. Milliron, department commander, Department of Michigan, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, sent me a copy of his investigation of deficiencies in the VA hospital at Allen Park.

And the findings of that study, part of the national VFW Project Alarm, are alarming indeed.

For example, Commander Milliron reported that the hospital had "a total funding deficiency of approximately \$1 million, had an adverse staff-patient ratio, had a serious shortage of radiologists, and then went on to describe the Allen Park facility as "an architectural monstrosity."

"What we need is a new Veterans Administration Hospital for the metropolitan area of Detroit, rather than continue to try and repair and maintain this facility," Commander Milliron said.

So that the full text of Commander Milliron's report, questions and answers on which the report was based, and a press release relating to the report be available to all those interested in the quality of

medical care in our VA hospitals, I ask unanimous consent that this material be printed at this point in the Record.

The material ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

APRIL 17, 1970.

RAYMOND A. GALLAGHER,
Commander in Chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, VFW Memorial Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR COMRADE GALLAGHER: On April 10, 1970, an on-the-site study of the deficiencies of the Veterans Administration Hospital, Allen Park, Michigan was accomplished in response to Project Alarm. Accompanying me were Richard Kuhn, M.D., Surgeon-General John Kulick, F.D.C., Member of the Department of Michigan Rehabilitation Committee, Raymond G. O'Neill, Department Service Officer, William J. Ash, Assistant Department Service Officer, assigned at Allen Park, and Constance J. Ebeling, also assigned at Allen Park, who served as our recording secretary in our meeting with Management.

A three-hour conference was held with Dr. Bernard W. Robinson, Hospital Director, Carl M. Mikail, Assistant Director, and Mr. Milton R. Weed, Chief of Staff, who were extremely cooperative. We have attached a copy of the questions that were presented at the meeting and the answers received. Our VFW party toured the hospital at the conclusion of the conference with Management. At 3:00 P.M., a press conference was held and the attached statement was released to all local news media. We have also attached a list of upstate papers that were furnished a copy of this statement. I regret to advise that there was no coverage given in the Detroit newspapers and we are checking with the upstate papers on their coverage. Any articles we receive from the various newspapers, we will forward them to you.

The following are my observations and opinions, as well as those of our visiting VFW team, as they relate to some of the vital question areas:

Staff Deficiencies: There are 52 vacant positions at the Allen Park Veterans Administration Hospital. Twenty-nine of these positions should be filled immediately. The only way this staffing situation could be corrected would be to give them some additional funds. We need an additional \$664,872.00 for the fiscal year of 1970-71 allocated for staff personnel to bring our hospital up to the staff level required to properly operate this hospital; therefore, the budgetary limitation should be lifted. We realize there is a shortage throughout the whole medical profession of radiologists and psychiatrists, but the situation at Allen Park is desperate. I will comment further on these items later in my report.

Rejection Rate: The rejection rate at this hospital is 42%. It is our feeling this rate is too high because of the strong possibility of selectivity of patients. We confronted Management on this aspect and they deny the selection of patients for training purposes. We wonder on this because of the surgical consultations that take place before admission is decided. Management advised that many of their rejections are in the area of veterans who did not plan to enter the hospital in the first place. The veteran merely wanted to come in for a physical for his own peace of mind. Since this is used as a reason for explanation of their rejection rate, it would be my recommendation that we ask the Veterans Administration Central Office to issue instructions to all hospitals in the country to keep a record of all rejected P-10's in two categories: (1) Veterans who withdraw their application because they did not have any intention of going into the hospital in the first place, and (2) those who were medically ineligible in fact and who had every intention

of entering the hospital. This way, we would have a true picture when we discuss this type of situation with Management.

Waiting List: There was no waiting list, nor has there been one for some time. We have, however, received many complaints through our Service Office from veterans who are on pre-bed care, stating that they are told to go home and they will be told when to report back, but never receive a notice from the Veterans Administration Hospital. When this is brought to the attention of Management, it is merely acknowledged as an administrative error. Pre-bed and post-hospital care was a big boom to our Veterans Administration Hospital program, but I am wondering on the pre-bed care aspect if we might not be dealing with semantics. Veterans listed under pre-bed care could very well be in fact a waiting list.

Nursing Home Care: The underfunding in this category is \$133,000.00. Nursing care is a big problem in the metropolitan area of Detroit. In the tri-county area of Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb, we have approximately 544,000 war veterans, and of this group, approximately 33,000 are of World War I vintage. On the basis of these figures, it is deductible we would have a great number of veterans requiring nursing care after they reach maximum hospital benefits at Allen Park.

Need of Special Care Units: We were informed that plans were being made to install a coronary intensive care unit, as well as some Cobalt treatment facilities. In response to our question about a hemodialysis unit, transplants, and spinal cord injury unit, we were told there were no plans for these because of the cost factor and facilities. It is our understanding that the hemodialysis treatment process runs about \$10,000.00 per year per patient and the Veterans Administration is currently limited with the number they have in operation. There seems to be an increased amount of thought of using the kidney machine in the home where it would reduce the cost considerably. Despite the cost factor, we are a large metropolitan area and have cases that are in need of this treatment process and we feel that this type of care should be provided at the Allen Park Veterans Administration Hospital. This new life-saving technique is a must in modern application of medicine.

In-Patient Neuropsychiatric Ward: This 50-bed ward is closed. They are unable to hire psychiatrists at the present VA pay scale.

Medical and Surgical Rehabilitation Ward: This ward has been reduced from 62 to 26 beds.

Radiologists: There is a staff shortage of six. Much of the work is being farmed out on a fee-basis at an extremely high cost to the hospital. In our conference with Management, when asked for the cost factor on this item, we were informed that this was "privileged information" and we could not get the actual cost. It would be appreciated if you would look into this matter and find out what money is being paid by Allen Park.

Staff Eligible for Retirement in 1970-71: We were informed that there were 15 medical doctors and 10 dentists, as well as many other positions, eligible for retirement. We will be in trouble on this item because Allen Park will be unable to compete on the market with the present VA salary structure. I know this will probably be a problem throughout the whole Veterans Administration system when the Class of '45 retires.

Dental: We were informed that Allen Park recently received \$507,000.00 from Central Office for the dental program and that the backlog on fee basis dental would be cleared up in approximately 5 weeks. They plan to work overtime to clear the backlog.

Medical Outpatient Treatment: There appears to be no problem in this area.

Patient Ratio: The Allen Park Veterans

Administration Hospital showed a 1.52 ratio. This item is further developed in my press release.

Propose New VA Hospital: In general, Allen Park as a physical plant, built in 1939, has served its usefulness. It is almost beyond description; you have to see it to believe it. It is no problem to get lost in the hospital, the way it is laid out. The hospital is an end product of several additions through the years, which has resulted in this architectural monstrosity. We feel that rather than put additional money in maintenance and repair into the existing hospital, the Veterans Administration should build a new hospital in Detroit. The veteran population I cited earlier warrants such construction. The Administrator of Veterans Affairs must be convinced of this need. A resolution will be forthcoming from the Department of Michigan on this aspect to be considered at the National Convention.

It is hopeful that we have given sufficient information on this facility for your purposes. Each of the items we treated are of the utmost importance, but if we were to go on a priority basis, it would be our recommendation that Priority #1 be that we use all our influence to change the Veterans Administration's pay scale for physicians. Our salary structure is disgraceful for the largest medical system in the world. Priority #2, almost as equally important, is the funding for new construction and maintenance. Priority #3 would be to provide more nursing care beds in the Veterans Administration hospital system.

I want to compliment you on Project Alarm. If there is any additional information required, please let me know.

Yours in comradeship,

JAMES L. MILLIRON,
Department Commander.

1. Question: Are there any substantial staffing or funding deficiencies?

Answer: Yes, due to lack of funds and scarcity of certain types of staffing. VA pay is not competitive and psychiatrists are paid more by the State and private institutions. At the present time the hospital is in need of 29 staff physicians and could use 23 more for a total of 52. 300 more employees would be required in the hospital to get a ratio of 2.2 employees to each patient. Current funding deficiencies for the fiscal year are estimated at \$988,207.

2. Question: Have you closed wards or beds in the last 6 months, or do you plan to do so?

Answer: No plans.

3. Question: What is the rejection rate? Is it increasing or decreasing?

Answer: 42%—staying about the same.

4. Question: Do you have a waiting list? If so, is it increasing or decreasing?

Answer: The Allen Park VA Hospital has not had a hospital waiting list in the past few years. It is now termed patients to be scheduled and they are not shown or indicated as waiting for hospitalization.

5. Question: Is the demand for hospital care, or in other words the application rate, increasing or decreasing?

Answer: Decreasing.

6. Question: Could outplacements to community nursing homes be increased if adequate funds were made available?

Answer: Outplacements to community nursing homes need \$200,000 more for fiscal year.

7. Question: What treatment technique deficiencies, particularly new specialized treatment programs, exist? Which of these, if any, do you expect to establish within the next 12 months?

Answer: Scheduled for 1971 are coronary care unit and a medical intensive care unit. A cobalt therapy unit is needed but not scheduled.

8. Question: In general, is the physical plant deteriorating because of lack of main-

tenance and repair funds or major renovation projects?

Answer: Yes, for the current year no repair funds are being provided for any project under \$5,000 unless it can be provided from the operating fund. This calls for diversion of funds of \$50,000 for the fiscal year.

9. Question: What is the major physical plant project most desperately needed?

Answer: Renovation of air conditioning in the surgical suite at the cost of \$385,000.

10. Question: What is the number of radiologists needed to completely staff the Allen Park VA Hospital and Outpatient Clinic? What is the estimated cost for fiscal year of two radiologists on staff, two consultant radiologists and clinic in Dearborn doing G.I. Series?

Answer: 6 radiologists are needed at a minimum and there are presently 2 on full time duty. Radiologists cannot be hired at the present pay scale of \$25,000-\$28,000 per year. The Hospital Director refused to answer the question of estimated cost for fiscal year on the grounds that it would invade the privacy of the Dearborn Outpatient Clinic. Presently 2 consultant radiologists, 2 fee basis radiologists and the private outpatient clinic are needed to supplement the 2 radiologists on duty.

11. Question: What is the number of operating beds? What is the number and type of beds unavailable because of lack of staff? What is the estimated A.D.P.L. for fiscal year? What is the A.D.P.L. to date? What is the present number of patients in hospital?

Answer: 770 operating beds; 76 beds unavailable; 650 beds A.D.P.L. for fiscal year; 608 beds A.D.P.L. to date; 552 beds occupied as of April 10, 1970.

12. Question: What is the number of staff physicians and dentists (hospital and outpatient) who will be eligible for retirement from present through 1972-1973 fiscal year? Are there any plans for replacement?

Answer: 15 staff physicians and 3 staff dentists—no plans for replacement.

13. Question: What is the present situation of funds on hand and anticipated need for balance of fiscal year of dental fee basis, medical fee basis, Prosthetic and Sensory Aids Unit?

Answer: Dental and medical funds are adequate, medical outpatient funds are adequate. Prosthetic and Sensory Aids funds are needed—\$45,000 more this year and \$22,000 has been diverted from other funds.

14. Question: What is the current percentage of P.B.C. admissions?

Answer: 1.2 at present compared to 2.5 in 1968.

15. Question: What is the number of staff physicians and rotating residents on normal daily duty in admitting section?

Answer: 2 staff physicians—1 of whom has retired and not been replaced; also, 2 rotating surgical residents.

16. Question: What are the reasons new physicians cannot be recruited?

Answer: No money, unavailability, adverse image and lack of up to date equipment.

17. Question: What is the estimated cost of painting if done by contract in five year cycles instead of present situation?

Answer: \$129,000 compared to \$65,000 when work is done by hospital employees. Areas scheduled for painting are running 2-5 years behind.

18. Question: What is the fiscal amount of funds allocated to maintenance, repairs and equipment? What amount of funds are diverted, or scheduled for diversion, for salaries this fiscal year?

Answer: Indications now show that \$167,835 will be diverted this year from other funds for salaries.

19. Question: What is the ratio of hospital employees to patients currently?

Answer: 1.52.

STATEMENT OF JAMES L. MILLIRON, DEPARTMENT COMMANDER, CONCERNING THE ALLEN PARK VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has recently expressed alarm concerning the numerous deficiencies in Veterans Administration Hospitals throughout the country. Staffing and funding inadequacies are alarming. Delay of purchase of new major equipment is common. Failure to operate available special medical service units, such as coronary intensive care units and kidney dialysis units, or to operate them with insufficient staffing is indefensible. Quality care depends on availability and proper operation of these new life-saving and life-prolonging techniques.

As Commander of the Department of Michigan, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I am especially interested in the Veterans Administration Hospitals in Michigan. I have today personally conducted a study of several glaring deficiencies at the Allen Park Veterans Administration Hospital and call attention to all veterans and the public of these vital deficiencies.

This hospital has a total funding deficiency of approximately one million dollars for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

Utilization of private nursing homes at less than half the cost of hospitalization for patients who no longer require hospitalization is retarded by underfunding in the amount of \$133,000. This is certainly false economy. There is a serious problem in the recruiting of physicians because of the present pay scale used by the Veterans Administration. They cannot compete with other governmental facilities and private hospitals because of the restricted pay levels.

We found that in some of the specialist fields, doctors in private hospitals have a starting salary at least double of that of specialists within the framework of the Veterans Administration. For example, the psychiatric in-patient service was closed at the Allen Park Veterans Administration Hospital a few years back because they were unable to recruit psychiatrists at the Veterans Administration pay grade authorized for this position.

This hospital was built in 1939. After our tour today, it is my judgment that the Allen Park Veterans Administration Hospital is an architectural monstrosity—it is not efficiently functional. Michigan has over one million veterans and approximately 50% of this amount reside in the Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb counties. What we need is a new Veterans Administration Hospital for the metropolitan area of Detroit, rather than continue to try and repair and maintain this facility.

The Veterans Administration staff-patient ratio throughout the system is only 1.5 with an increase to only 1.56 planned for the 1971 fiscal year. At the Allen Park Veterans Administration Hospital, the ratio is 1.52 staff for each patient. The average in general medical, community, state, and local government hospitals is 2.72. To bring the Veterans Administration staffing ratio to 2 employees per patient, which would still be substandard, would cost approximately \$250 million for the entire system and 2.7 million dollars at the Allen Park Veterans Administration Hospital.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is concerned by the failure of the Administration staffing ratio to provide the quantity and quality care to which veterans are entitled.

As Commander of the Department of Michigan, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I urge all veterans and all citizens interested in the quality and availability of the medical care for veterans who have served this nation in time of war to write to the President of the United States and to their Congressmen and Senators, requesting adequate funds and staffing for the Veterans Ad-

ministration system. The young, wounded veterans returning from battle in Viet Nam should certainly be assured of first class medical care.

Mr. HART. And finally, my third reason for asking for an increase in VA appropriations was based on hearings I have conducted as Chairman of the Senate Anti-Trust and Monopoly Subcommittee.

Those hearings on the high cost of hospital care made quite clear that the administration's budget request of \$1.75 billion, while the highest in history, hardly meets the added cost of health care caused by inflation alone.

On top of that increase, we have the added cost of treating the growing number of persons wounded in Southeast Asia.

To refuse to increase the VA budget to meet the added costs of treating persons wounded in Southeast Asia is to ask our wounded to carry the brunt of two wars—the one in Southeast Asia and the one against inflation.

Certainly no veteran wounded in Vietnam should be asked to accept less than the best care because the Government wants to cut Federal spending.

While not pertinent to the budget considerations at hand, let me broaden that position to state that no veteran of any war, nor any person in the United States, should be asked to accept inferior health care resulting from a cutback in Federal funds.

Certainly we should not ask the wounded and sick to assume any portion of the cost of cooling the economy.

Mr. President, the \$125 million increase for VA medical care and construction of VA health facilities is a big step in giving treatment of wounded veterans the priority it deserves.

I want to compliment both Senator Cranston and Senator Pastore for their leadership in this effort.

And as we look forward to a House-Senate Conference on this bill, I want to take this opportunity to make clear my support for this increase.

The committee recommendation is a minimum increase, and should not be reduced in conference.

VETERANS HOSPITALS: ONLY THE BEST WILL DO

Mr. GORE. One of the traditions of which our country can justly be proud is that of providing medical care to the veterans who have served this country. We, as a nation, have been committed to the proposition that our veterans are entitled to the finest medical care that can be afforded. And this is as it should be. For we can give no less to those who have been asked to give so much—their mental and physical health, and, indeed, their very lives—for all of us.

The cornerstone of medical services for veterans is our system of veterans hospitals. These hospitals, and the dedicated people who man them, have always done their best to see that adequate medical care is afforded our veterans.

But disturbing reports have been reaching me from my constituents that conditions in our veterans hospitals are not meeting those high standards which we all want to provide and which our veterans are entitled to expect. Such a situation cannot be tolerated. Whatever we may think of the policies that have produced the various wars in which our country has been engaged, I have always believed that it is our duty to provide the finest medical care to those who need it as the result of the performance of their duty in our armed services. I have, therefore, always strongly supported measures to insure adequate funds for our veterans hospitals.

With the rising cost of medical equipment and supplies, with the increased sophistication of medical treatment facilities, with the continuing development of new medical technology, it is imperative that the veterans hospitals be supplied with funds to enable

them to provide our veterans with the best medical assistance that our society can offer. I hope and urge the Senate meet its responsibility by voting the funds necessary to bring our veterans hospitals up to the highest standards of medical care.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JAVITS

Mr. President, if the Veterans Administration is to address itself to its most urgent inadequacies and doing all it can for our veterans, it is essential that we support the Appropriations Committee's \$100,000,000 increase in funding for Veterans Administration medical care and construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.

Many veterans hospitals face the dilemma of skyrocketing medical and drug cost and ever-mounting workloads, on the one hand, and insufficient funding and staffing allocations on the other. There are four major problem areas: medical care, education and training of hospital personnel, medical and prosthetic research, and construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.

In the medical care category, the principal deficiency is the lack of sufficient staff. In comparison to an average staff-to-patient ratio of 2.7 to 1 in community hospitals, and a 3 to 1 ratio in university hospitals connected with medical schools, the Veterans Administration ratio is 1.5 to 1. In every-day terms, this means that in the Buffalo VA hospital, a 30-bed psychiatric ward has been closed for lack of staff to man it and that in the Bronx VA hospital, there is from midnight to 8:00 a.m. one registered nurse to care for approximately 100 patients.

The staff shortage is especially acute in view of the trend toward more patients to be served. In the last year, Buffalo's VA hospital attended to 8500 patients in comparison to 8368 the previous year. With 16,000 more Vietnam veterans expected to come to VA hospitals for care in the coming year, the impending additional strain on personnel is all too obvious. Furthermore, to make use of the most efficient, advanced equipment for treating the acute needs of its veterans, the VA hospitals are trying to activate some 150 badly-needed special medical services. However, intensive care units, coronary care units, pulmonary functional units, and additional spinal cord injury centers, require intensive staffing which in turn drains the already scarce staff attending the core hospital.

The consequences of insufficient staffing are aggravated by a backlog of equipment shortages and maintenance repairs (estimated at \$46 million) and many VA hospital directors are thus forced to reallocate funds that otherwise would have been used to purchase, renovate, or repair needed equipment or facilities, to instead pay hospital staffs.

If the VA is to improve its staffing ratios, it must do so with paramedical and paraprofessional personnel, for there are just not enough medical personnel available in the general community to meet the VA's needs. It is therefore essential that the VA receive adequate funding to continue its education programs, that it may train some 1274 allied health professionals in over 20 specialties, 60 intensive care specialties, 210 physician's assistants, and 1150 spinal cord personnel.

Essential to attracting and retaining high caliber personnel, and to improving the quality of care administered, is an active, large medical research program. Recent funding levels have restricted the VA programs to the extent that only ongoing research has been continued. In the absence of new projects, results of the former cannot possibly be translated into direct improvements in patient care. The VA's own Department of Medicine and Surgery last year estimated that \$17 million is needed to bridge the gap between research and its application.

The House-approved \$1.777 billion budget

is an all-time high for VA medical care. However, that amount is still \$50 million below the level estimated as necessary for FY 1971, more than a year ago by the VA's Department of Medicine and Surgery. The 7.5% increase H.R. 17548 now provides barely covers the tremendous demand and cost for care, both of which have inflated beyond expectation since that time.

I fully support the Committee's recommendation to add \$80,000,000 for needed care to be expended by the Administrator for anything that he feels will add to the goal of attaining for all veterans the best medical service obtainable, whether it be intensive-care units, special care for spinal injuries, changing locations to obtain special help, or equipment for the comfort of the patient, or anything else that may be needed in the operation of the VA hospitals and its recommendation to add \$20,000,000 for construction of hospitals and domiciliary facilities to be expended by the Administrator for air conditioning or anything else that he feels will add to the goal of attaining for all veterans the best medical service obtainable.

I believe we must establish as a national commitment the provision of the best health care money can buy for our wounded war veterans.

Mr. Moss. Mr. President, I support the \$100 million increase for Veterans' Administration medical and hospital care programs added by the Senate Committee to the House-passed Independent Offices Appropriation bill. I urge that the Senate Conferees stand firm in their insistence that the higher figure be included in the bill which is sent to the President for signature.

There can be no question, surely, about the importance of improving the medical care which our veterans of the war in Vietnam are receiving. Our public media have been filled with pictures and stories of young men who have been tragically wounded in the war in Vietnam and who are getting second rate hospital and medical care from the country which sent them into battle.

It is one of the anomalies of our times—and a tragic one that we spend billions of dollars in producing the most sophisticated and deadly weapons of war to put in the hands of our fighting forces in Vietnam, but refuse to give those who are badly wounded and permanently incapacitated the best we have developed in medical care and treatment.

It is my understanding that if the 100 million dollar increase is allowed to stand, some \$347,000 could be allocated to the Salt Lake Veterans Hospital to be used as follows:

Additional general medical care personnel	\$208,000
Elimination of equipment, maintenance and repair backlog	29,200
Elimination of dental care backlog	27,100
Physician's assistants	47,600
Allied health and intensive care training	35,100
Total	347,000

Not long ago I visited our Salt Lake Veterans Hospital, where I first went from ward to ward to talk with some of the patients and then met Hospital Director W. E. Stonebraker and Chief of Staff, Dr. Ralph B. Romney.

The fiscal year 1971 budget for the hospital is approximately 10 million dollars which is about an 8 per cent increase over last year. However, it requires between a 6 and 10 per cent increase each year simply to keep up with inflation, so the budget request increase would not cover any improvement in services or pay raises for personnel.

If it were not for the dedication of the present staff, Mr. Stonebraker says, it would be impossible to maintain the level of care the hospital is now achieving. There is a

need for an additional 30 to 35 people—mostly nurses and physicians to be used for the most part in intensive care, day hospital care and ward coverage.

Mr. Stonebreaker says they also should reestablish a radioisotope service, which was closed last year because of lack of funds.

The Salt Lake Veterans Hospital is now giving the best possible care to their patients with the funds and equipment it has—of this I am convinced. An increase in money would not allow the staff to care for more patients, but to give a better quality of care to patients. At the present time, Utah is "making do" with what they have. When they get more patients, the staff simply makes what they have to do for the increased number of people they must care for.

This is not good enough for our veterans—not good enough for those who have sustained wounds, and in many instances become lifetime invalids—fighting the nation's wars.

We must provide adequate funds to assure first-class treatment to every veteran in our VA hospitals everywhere.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee, I have followed closely the testimony from the hearings stretching from November 21 to April 28. I, too, am concerned at the lack of adequate care received by our veterans. Veterans' Administration hospitals should deliver quality medical care. Those who have been wounded in defense of their country must not be sent to understaffed and ill-equipped hospitals. I believe that the increase of \$100 million in the medical and hospital appropriation recommended by the Appropriations Subcommittee is urgently needed and I strongly support it. I further would like to compliment the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), and the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee (Mr. CRANSTON) for their efforts on its behalf.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in the month since Life magazine published its controversial expose of the deplorable conditions in our national veterans hospitals, the demand for an immediate end to this intolerable situation has grown. The consciences of millions of Americans were outraged when a subsequent television program showed helpless men, victims in their country's cause, waiting patiently for a glass of water or a bedpan which had been requested hours before.

Americans have been led to believe that only the finest medical treatment was to be provided for those men who have made the heaviest sacrifices in defending our freedom. It is therefore not surprising that the revelations of the shocking realities were met with expressions of disbelief and categorical denials. We owe a heavy debt of gratitude to Senator CRANSTON and the Veterans Affairs Subcommittee for documenting these allegations and making them credible. Senator PASTORE, who as chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee further helped to focus the spotlight of public concern on this tragedy, also deserves our thanks.

What is in question in this debate, is not the skill or dedication of the staff of the veterans hospitals. The sad truth is we have made it impossible for these de-

voted public servants to give the first-rate medical care necessary by refusing to provide funds for adequate personnel and facilities. Moreover, these conditions should not be assumed to exist in all veterans hospitals. Most of the veterans hospitals are doing a good job; some are truly outstanding; but in some, medical care borders on the medieval.

Doctors have described the facilities at Wadsworth Hospital in California as filthy. Even patients who are in severe pain are reluctant to remain there long. Not only is the atmosphere depressing but patients actually run the risk of infection because the wards are so unsanitary. Staff morale is understandably low, nurses feel as if they are only offering custodial care. Because the number of nursing hours per patient day in the extended care unit of Wadsworth is less than half the minimum criteria used by the California State Department of Public Health's bureau of licensing and certification, Wadsworth would not be licensed to operate in California were it not a Federal facility.

Fortunately, there are no such horror stories to report from Indiana. Nevertheless, major problems do exist, typical of those facing the majority of our veterans' hospitals.

The primary deficiency is the lack of staff. While general medical community hospitals and State and local government hospitals have an average staff ratio of 2.7 employees for each patient, the Veterans' Administration has only 1.5 staff members for each patient. Expert testimony suggests that the optimal staff ratio for optimal veterans care lies somewhere in between; a figure of two staff members per patient has been mentioned. Last year, the veterans hospital at Indianapolis had a ratio of staff to patients of 1.57; the hospital at Fort Wayne, a ratio of 1.4. The two hospitals together would require 298 additional positions to achieve what is regarded as an adequate staff-patient ratio.

Psychiatric facilities, such as the large hospital at Marion, while not requiring as many employees, a 1-to-1 ratio being thought acceptable, face very severe shortages in key areas. There is only one psychiatrist for every 535 patients in VA neuropsychiatric hospitals. To upgrade the quality of the Marion hospital, another 200 employees should be added.

Besides personnel shortages, the Indiana veterans' hospitals must cope with funding deficiencies for the community nursing care program and the fee basis dental care program which have increased workloads due to the return of Vietnam veterans. In December of last year, the director of the 670-bed Indianapolis hospital reported that the hospital was not fully funded for 22 positions at an annual cost of \$252,000. He also reported a shortage of \$444,000 in other operating expenses which included \$32,000 for medical supplies, \$20,000 for drugs and medicines, \$60,000 for prosthetic appliances, and the balance in other operating supplies and services.

In order to make ends meet, the administrator of the Indianapolis hospital was forced to do what his counterparts around the country have had to do—divert funds allotted for new and replace-

ment equipment and maintenance to the more immediate needs. Purchases deferred included anesthesia apparatus and the replacement of 52 hospital beds with manually operated adjustable beds. Under these circumstances, it is difficult to do everything possible to either speed the recovery and rehabilitation of our veterans or to make their position more comfortable.

Cutting corners to save money for the essentials has led to the use of obsolete equipment in antiquated buildings. Dr. Thomas Gonda, director of the Stanford University Hospital testified concerning this problem at his institution:

The X-ray facilities are obsolete, in the worst sense of the word. Broken down in a very, very true sense. The equipment there has to be constantly repaired . . . the hospital itself has been trying to do something about it for some time, and has run into snags, fiscal snags.

Rundown and shabby buildings tie in very directly with the difficulty in attracting new personnel, in addition to demoralizing patients and staff alike. Brig. Gen. Thomas J. Whelan, Jr., special assistant to the Surgeon General, has stated that—

Modern medicine can be practiced only in a modern facility, a modern hospital. Modernization of facilities and equipment is no longer a luxury but is a definite continuing necessity.

Yet, today, veterans hospitals lag far behind in this respect. Dr. Bennett, head of the Marion Hospital, reports:

It would not be economically feasible to try to bring these old buildings up to modern day standards; however, in view of the anticipated workload and the time lag in new construction there must be a marked increase in the allocation of maintenance funds to provide the best possible patient facilities in the existing plant.

Air conditioning is almost a necessity for any modern hospital in a warm area; nevertheless, patients are sweltering in the summer heat in over 40 veterans hospitals from Gulfport, Miss., to Marion, Ind.

How has this state of affairs come about? The most crippling and seriously disabling war ever fought by this country caught the VA hospitals at a time when their budget requests were being denied and a ceiling, since removed, had been placed on their number of personnel. Veterans hospitals are being squeezed between higher medical and drug costs and rising workloads. In fiscal year 1970 the Veterans' Administration will treat 38,000 more patients than it did in fiscal year 1966 with almost 7,000 fewer hospital beds. Outpatient visits have shot up nearly 1,250,000 over the number in 1966. A large part of the increase consists of servicemen returning from Vietnam. Last year there were 50,000 admissions for Vietnam veterans and 520,000 visits made by Vietnam veterans for outpatient medical care.

The war in Southeast Asia has not only increased the workload of the VA hospitals but has also changed the nature of the problems they must be prepared to handle. Because of rapid helicopter evacuation from the battlefield and the use of modern antibiotics, the one out of every 10 wounded who would

have died under World War II conditions, is saved. The seriously wounded thus saved have raised the number of amputees and spinal cord injured in our VA hospitals. It is one of the war's bitterest paradoxes that while we are able to save more lives than ever before on the battlefield, we are unable to give these men the intensive care necessary if they are to be returned to regular life. The national commander of the Disabled American Veterans states of the VA center in Los Angeles:

Vietnam amputees at this facility are not receiving necessary social services, psychiatric and other necessary additional training due to lack of personnel.

Delays in treating spinal cord injuries in some cases may impair the patient for life. There is also the new problem of drug abuse—a special medical program may need to be developed especially for the treatment of this problem.

It is for these reasons that Senator CRANSTON's recommendation to increase the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration has my wholehearted support.

A large part of this increase will go toward funding the vital staff positions now unfilled, enhancing medical care at all the 166 VA hospitals. In hospitals, where equipment now goes unused because of staff shortages, long-awaited care can then be provided. Other hospitals where doctors have struggled along with inadequate and obsolete equipment will benefit from the substantial part of the increase which will go for eliminating the backlog of equipment and maintenance.

Special attention should be given to the provision to provide for more professionals in the field of spinal cord injuries. It would do little real good to drain these personnel away from other institutions around the country where they are sorely needed. The proposal would have the VA train individuals to fill about 1,000 new positions. This points up the fact that the VA system is the greatest single health personnel trainer in this country. At a time when we are confronted with a shortage of health professionals in all areas, it is essential that the VA continue in this role.

The proposal also calls for elimination of the backlog in dental examinations and treatment. Vietnam veterans are now having to wait up to 6 months for dental care. Institutions of a fee arrangement is the only way to end this delay.

Money would also be provided for research purposes. There is a distinct correlation between the quality of patient care and research. Nearly half of our veterans hospitals maintain some kind of relation with medical schools. Research is a bridge for many top quality personnel between the universities and the VA system.

Finally, funds would be set aside for air conditioning the hospitals mentioned previously. An attempt would be made to renovate some of the older buildings. Some, such as Wadsworth, will need to be replaced by new construction.

It would be a tragedy in an age where medicine promises better and better care, when the veteran population is rapidly

rising, if Congress were to reject an appropriation to allow the Veterans' Administration to go forward, maintaining its past reputation for excellence.

Some will say that we cannot afford to have our veterans cared for in clean, pleasant surroundings; that providing the latest equipment devised by medical science is too expensive, or that the cost of rehabilitating these men is inflationary. Those who boast that no price is too great to pay where defense is concerned should remind themselves that veterans care is very much a part of that price. With rare unanimity, the American people have expressed the conviction that only the best medical care is good enough for our veterans.

VETERANS NEED ADEQUATE MEDICAL CARE—SENATOR CRANSTON PROVIDES EFFECTIVE LEADERSHIP

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is tragic for our young men wounded or even permanently disabled in the prime of their lives to be confined to medical facilities which are prohibited from providing adequate medical care because of a lack of funds. It is equally tragic that veterans of previous military campaigns who have earned and are entitled to VA medical care are not receiving needed services. This is false economy.

Even during times of inflation and tight money, it is our responsibility to insure that our veterans have the best possible medical care and treatment. This entails more than just giving them a hospital bed and a limited amount of attention. This is in no way a criticism of our Veterans' Administration personnel who are doing a commendable job under difficult circumstances.

The Vietnam conflict has caused us to recognize serious deficiencies in medical care available in veterans hospitals, due to improved medical capabilities on the battlefield and due to the nature of the fighting. This has been documented by the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) in hearings covering a 6-month period from November 1969 through April 1970.

Matters pertaining to veterans are very dear to me. As a member of the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee and a former chairman, I have been closely involved with their programs for a number of years. I commend Senator CRANSTON for his initiative and persistence in investigating the situation in our Veterans' Administration hospitals. I share his concern and stand with him in his endeavor to obtain adequate funds to meet the current need and eliminate critical backlogs in construction and equipment.

As Senators know, the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices and Housing and Urban Development, which handles veterans matters, under the guidance of the able Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) has recommended in addition to the \$25 million added by the House \$100 million for medical care and construction in this fiscal year. This is \$125 million over the President's request. This action was based, in large measure, on the record developed by the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee.

I congratulate the senior Senator from Rhode Island and the members of the Appropriations Committee for recommending the additional funds. I stand behind them 100 percent. It is my belief based on the documentation which has been developed that this is the minimum acceptable level of funding. I urge that we stand fast on this figure when this bill is sent to House-Senate conference.

Veterans hospitals in my State of West Virginia have suffered due to the inadequate availability of funds. It has been reported that there are backlogs in repairs and equipment, curtailment in staffing, and required shifting of funds to meet personnel and operating expenses. The additional funds will allow hospitals in my State to better meet these critical deficiencies.

Mr. President, medical care for our veterans should be second to none. Time and money are required to insure this goal. Neither of these can be compromised. I urge the Senate and the Congress to speak with a firm and united voice by agreeing to funding proposals contained in the pending bill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION HAS OBLIGATION TO GIVE SERVICE MEN BEST MEDICAL CARE

Sen. Alan Cranston, D-Calif., as chairman of the Senate Veterans Affairs Subcommittee, has reported that service men wounded in Vietnam are receiving the best medical treatment in any U.S. war.

Prompt and skilled medical and surgical treatment in the field now save thousands that before would have died. Prompt evacuation often minutes after men are wounded saves time in more extensive hospital treatment and prevents many deaths.

Since the beginning of the war more than 275,000 have been wounded, and one out of every 10 of them would have died in any of the country's former wars.

This is a tribute to the medical men and the organization that enables them to apply their skill promptly.

But Sen. Cranston's six-month study disclosed that, despite dedicated and highly trained medical personnel, this extraordinary care is not continued in most Veterans Administration hospitals.

The chairman told his subcommittee that excellent treatments are being given at some hospitals and that staffs are doing the best they can under difficult conditions.

Difficulties generally are caused by insufficient funds. Reports of inadequate financing, at the hospital here and at others throughout the country have previously been made.

As a result of his study, Sen. Cranston recommended that Congress raise the Veterans Administration budget by \$189 million.

Almost \$174 million would be allotted to improving medical care at the 166 hospitals and 202 outpatient clinics in the country.

The shortage of funds and personnel, the senator told his subcommittee, has precipitated a crisis. Year after year inadequate funds have forced the postponement of necessary outlays for supplies and equipment, building new facilities and expanding staffs to needed numbers.

Foot draggers in the administration contend, however, that the VA budget is already

at a record level and that inflation requires economy.

That, the average American citizen will conclude, is a cold-blooded way of considering the needs of men who have laid their lives on the line and almost lost them for the country.

The hospital here and others in West Virginia have received two grants in recent months for new equipment and improved care, but still more is needed.

Individuals as well as veterans' organizations should apply whatever pressure is necessary to see that sufficient funds are provided to give every wounded serviceman the best treatment possible.

Anything less is unworthy of the nation that sends its men out to fight in the name of freedom.

Mr. CRANSTON. I want to express my deep thanks to the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), who served with distinction as chairman of the Veterans Subcommittee for almost 2 years, for his fine statement and his strong support. His dedication to the cause of justice for veterans is well known.

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I strongly and fully support efforts by the Congress to economize and to reduce Federal governmental expenditures. This is an essential part of our national struggle against inflation—a struggle which must be won.

I particularly support efforts to reduce those questionable expenditures which are related to our military establishment and the current efforts to reorder our priorities. Too much of our Nation's wealth, and too much of our limited tax revenues, have been used for financing war and preparation for war.

But there is one aspect of our defense-related activities where our record is one of spending too little rather than too much. I refer to the disgraceful situation which prevails in our Nation's veterans hospitals, and to our insufficient national commitment to provide decent care for those who have given so much in the service of their country—our veterans.

We rightfully pride ourselves on the fact that, when the American fighting man goes into action, he has at his command the best equipment, the best training, and the best chance of survival that money can buy. This should be no less true when the wounded comes home, sometimes to a lifetime of disability and required medical care.

Unfortunately, our record here is tarnished. We seem to be short on remembering in a meaningful way our obligation to the brave fighting men who, due to injuries and illnesses, suffered in the line of duty now spend their days in hospitals or require other medical care. I believe our record here is a national disgrace.

In the Vietnam war we have performed medical and evacuation miracles. We save a far greater proportion of the wounded than was previously the case—and this record is a source of solace for some and of just pride for the medical personnel of our Armed Forces.

But our record of caring for these wounded when they are faced with months and years, and sometimes a lifetime, of hospital care because of the nature of their injuries is sad indeed. I, therefore, strongly support the recom-

mendation of the Senate Appropriations Committee in urging an additional \$100 million over the House-approved figure for the Veterans' Administration for medical assistance and hospital construction purposes.

I wish to take this opportunity to commend Senator JOHN PASTORE and Senator ALAN CRANSTON for their efforts on behalf of these too-often-forgotten Americans. While this action still falls short of meeting our moral obligation to these men, it does demonstrate our awareness and our concern. We can do no less.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 1455. An act to amend section 8c(2) (A) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to provide for marketing orders for apples produced in Colorado, Utah, New Mexico, Illinois, and Ohio:

S. 3564. An act to amend the Federal Youth Corrections Act (18 U.S.C. 5005 et seq.) to permit examiners to conduct interviews with youth offenders;

S. 3598. An act to amend section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish financial assistance in carrying out plans for works of improvement for land conservation and utilization, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 201. Joint resolution to extend the reporting date of the National Commission on Consumer Finance.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 16595) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MOSHER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions:

H.R. 16739. An act to extend until July 3, 1974, the existing authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to maintain offices in the Republic of the Philippines;

H.J. Res. 224. Joint resolution to change the name of Pleasant Valley Canal, California, to "Coalinga Canal"; and

H.J. Res. 746. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution authorizing appropriations for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received today, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17548) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 745

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I call up Amendment No. 745, and ask unanimous consent that its reading be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 20, line 11, strike out "\$2,606,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,486,100,000".

On page 20, line 12, insert before the period a colon and the following: "Provided, That this appropriation shall not be available for the design or definition of any space shuttle or space station".

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this amendment is jointly sponsored by Senators CASE, JAVITS, PROXMIRE, and myself. It would reduce the NASA fiscal year 1971 appropriation for research and development by \$110 million—the amount requested by NASA for design and definition of the space shuttle/station. The amendment also would prohibit the use of any part of the NASA appropriation for that purpose. This is the identical issue which the Senate debated on the NASA authorization a few weeks ago.

There are two basic aspects of this space shuttle/station project. The first is to develop a chemically fueled, two-stage reusable shuttle, which will operate between the surface of the earth and low earth orbit. The second is to develop a space station module as a permanent structure in orbit designed initially for the support of six to 12 occupants; ultimately, NASA hopes to erect a space base by joining together these space station modules, and this base will be capable of supporting between 50 and 100 men in earth orbit.

At the very minimum, this project represents what NASA itself calls "a new epoch in manned space flight." It is the beginning of a new phase of the manned space program—a phase as large or larger in scope than the Apollo program.

The \$110 million requested for the coming fiscal year is only a small part of the project's ultimate cost. NASA's preliminary cost estimates for development of the space shuttle/station total almost \$14 billion, and if the past is any basis for

estimating, I believe that the cost could go far in excess of \$14 billion. For example, the original \$6 billion estimate for the shuttle has now risen to \$10 billion, and NASA officials readily concede that these preliminary estimates are unreliable. Indeed, preliminary cost estimates in the space field are uniformly low, often only a fraction of ultimate cost. It is quite likely, therefore, that the ultimate cost of this project will greatly exceed \$14 billion.

The space shuttle/station is intimately related to an even more ambitious effort. There is every reason to believe that NASA proposes to embark this year upon a new space program based upon new hardware, almost entirely in support of manned missions, with a manned Mars landing as the ultimate objective. The space shuttle station is the first step toward this objective.

Without the space shuttle and without the 100-man space station to assemble the various spacecraft and other paraphernalia to get men to Mars, no Mars program is possible. NASA has testified that as soon as the space shuttle and space station have been developed, it plans to spend for a manned Mars exploration program \$100 million in fiscal year 1977, \$300 million in fiscal 1978, and \$1 billion in fiscal 1979. In other words, the Space Agency hopes to be spending \$1 billion a year, at a minimum, in fiscal 1979, for the purpose of manned flight to Mars. If this is so, a space shuttle/station will be the initial phase of a program with an estimated cost of \$50 to \$100 billion over the next 15 years.

Once again, the Senate is asked to back into an enormously expensive program, with tremendous implications not only for the Space Agency but also for the allocation of this Nation's scientific and industrial resources; and we are asked to do so on a fairly innocent \$110 million basis, which in fact involves a commitment eventually of somewhere between \$50 and \$100 billion.

Proponents of this project strongly deny that its approval in any way amounts to approval of a manned flight to Mars. But they concede that the space shuttle and station are essential first steps for such a flight.

To make the case for our amendment, however, it is not necessary to demonstrate the relationship between the shuttle/station and a planned manned landing on Mars. For no one denies that the space shuttle/station is the beginning of a new and expanded manned space program. Thus, our approval of this appropriation must be considered as initial congressional approval of this "new epoch in manned space flight."

Our amendment is a bipartisan effort to prevent Congress from sliding into such a commitment—a commitment which eventually will cost the American taxpayer billions of dollars.

The proponents of the space shuttle/station insist that the \$110 million requested for design and definition does not commit us to its development. They contend that this money is for further "study," not development, and that the crucial decision whether to proceed with this project will be made next year by NASA and Congress.

Implicit in this argument is the notion that \$110 million is a minor expenditure. It is not—\$110 million is more than the administration has budgeted in fiscal year 1971 to combat air pollution; it is more than the \$84 million special milk program, which the President wants to terminate as an "economy measure"; and it is twice what we spend for one of our most effective antipoverty efforts, OEO's legal services programs.

In any event, it is clear that the requested funding for design and definition of this project is for more than basic research—conducted in NASA's own laboratories. Design and definition is what NASA calls "Phase B" of a planned project. In fiscal year 1970, NASA spent \$18.5 million to complete "Phase A," that is, to determine the feasibility of the shuttle and station. NASA now wants to move to "Phase B," and it has already awarded contracts for this purpose to several aerospace companies.

An \$18.5 million expenditure has thus escalated into a request to spend an additional \$110 million. Private contractors are involved, and industry is eagerly anticipating large contracts in the future.

If the past is any guide, NASA will ask Congress next year for several hundred million more for this project, and return again and again for hundreds of millions to continue its development. Congress will then be told that it is too late to stop the project—too late because of the enormous funds already invested.

It does not make a great deal of difference, then, whether one characterizes the \$110 million in this bill as "development" or a "study." In either case, the approval of these funds might well put us on the road toward another multi-billion dollar manned space program.

While maintaining that no commitment is involved in approving this appropriation, the project's proponents also argue that the shuttle will actually save the taxpayer's money. They contend that the shuttle, unlike present boosters, will be reusable, and could thereby reduce the cost per pound of payload in orbit by a factor of 10. But for reasons which I shall set forth for the Record, this assumes a tremendous increase in space flights in order to reduce the per-pound costs by that amount.

To begin with, it will cost billions of dollars to develop the space shuttle. Once developed, it has been estimated that the shuttle will cost hundreds of millions to procure, whereas the launch vehicles to be replaced by the space shuttle—Delta through Titan—cost from \$3.5 million to \$20 million for each vehicle. Given these extremely high development and procurement costs, the alleged "savings" by the use of the shuttle will occur only if the scope of U.S. space activities is greatly expanded in future years.

NASA officials are relying on such expansion. They have testified that a minimum of 30 flights per year by NASA and an equivalent number in support of DOD programs are anticipated.

The leading House opponent of the space shuttle/station—Congressman

JOSEPH KARTH of Minnesota, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications and a strong supporter of the space program—made the following observation about NASA's calculations:

During the entire decade of the sixties, NASA exceeded 30 launches per year only once—36 in 1966—including Scouts and Saturn V's which are not to be replaced by the space shuttle. Assuming the space shuttle's payload capacity (of placing 50,000 pounds in orbit) would be fully utilized on each of the projected 60 yearly flights, this adds up to 3 million pounds of payload launched into orbit each year.

How do 3 million pounds of payload in orbit compare with the space program of the past? In terms of cumulative payload launched, 1969 was NASA's biggest year with 442,358 pounds, over 97 percent of which was attributed to the four Apollo flights.

Congressman KARTH notes that the NASA budget—which has declined annually since 1965—must increase dramatically during the next few years to support this project if the space shuttle is to fly by 1977; and their budget would have to increase even more after the shuttle becomes operational in order to support the kind of ambitious program it is designed to serve.

I question whether the United States can afford such an ambitious space program and whether the American taxpayer would be willing to support it. Rather than testing the taxpayer's endurance, we should follow the course recommended by seven members of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics—that is, cost effectiveness—studies should be conducted comparing the operation of the space shuttle with the continued use of existing expendable launch vehicles before sizable amounts of money are applied to the project.

I think it is clear that if we appropriate the funds requested here, we will be committing this Nation to a vastly more expensive and ambitious effort than the project's proponents would have us believe. But aside from the potential cost of both the shuttle and station, there are other basic reasons for opposing this project.

To begin with, it is premature to begin design and definition at this time. This project is based on the assumption that man will be able to function effectively in a space environment for long periods of time. Yet, at this point, we simply do not know the feasibility of long-duration operations in such an environment.

A 1969 report by the House Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications stated that:

If there is an ultimate limiting factor (to exploring space), it may well be the length of time through which man can endure the influences of the hostile environments encountered beyond the earth. The extent and limits of human frailty or endurance have not yet been established.

Weightlessness and other special effects of the space environment may be extremely deleterious and even fatal to man after extended space flight.

I find this very peculiar—that NASA is asking for \$110 million to design a space station when the feasibility for long duration manned flight is unknown.

We have made some effort to test this

with the Bio-satellite III mission which sent a monkey into earth orbit. This flight resulted in the death of the monkey after 8½ days of a scheduled 30-day flight. Medical experts believe that the monkey died of an excessive loss of bodily fluids due to weightlessness.

According to news accounts, the Soviet cosmonauts aboard Soyuz 9 have been troubled with instability of the cardiovascular system and difficulty in sleeping after their record space flight of nearly 18 days. A number of American scientists feel that the medical results of this flight reinforce their view that many unanswered questions remain about the biomedical effects of long-duration space flight.

I ask unanimous consent that a more detailed description of the medical effects of long-termed space flight be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the description was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To date, astronauts have flown for periods up to 14 days with no irreversible deleterious effects. Medical authorities have testified, however, that they do not yet understand the biological or physiological effects of extended manned space flight.

There are many unknowns regarding the possible effects of prolonged weightlessness on major physiological systems of the human body, e.g. gastrointestinal, nervous, urinary, inner ear (balance), biological clock, etc.

But the most severe effect of weightlessness appears to be on the cardiovascular system. Prolonged weightlessness results in what is called the Gauer Henry reflex. Briefly, this is described as follows: In a state of weightlessness a person's blood tends to concentrate around the heart, in the area of the chest cavity, and away from the body's extremities. Nervous sensors in the vicinity of the heart respond to the pooling of this excessive volume of blood around the heart by actuating a reflex mechanism which, in order to reestablish an appropriate level of fluid in that area causes large-scale losses of body fluid, primarily through perspiration. A new equilibrium is thereby established in which the total blood supply of the individual is substantially reduced.

A potentially dangerous situation occurs when the individual is brought back to Earth and subjected to one or more "g's." The reason it is dangerous is that the reduced blood supply tends to be drawn away from the heart and to the lower extremities when the body is subjected to "g" forces. The heart may be so starved for blood at this point that it may cease to function.

It is not known whether or how the body will adjust to these changes from weightlessness to a "g" environment, or what procedures or techniques may be needed to overcome the problem, and the Skylab project is designed to resolve this and similar questions. Skylab is specifically designed to test man's ability to survive and work in space first for 28 days and then 56 days. Essentially, Skylab will produce sufficient physiological data to determine whether extended manned space flight is feasible.

The Biosatellite III mission is instructive on the effects of weightlessness on the cardiovascular system. That mission resulted in the death of a highly instrumented primate after eight and one-half days of a scheduled 30-day flight. Medical experts associated with Biosatellite III believe that the monkey died as a result of weightlessness and the Gauer Henry reflex.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, NASA, of course, is most concerned about these

important medical problems. The Sky Lab project, scheduled to begin in 1972, will be an earth orbiting manned station designed to determine the feasibility of manned operations in a space environment over extended periods of time. This project will utilize modified hardware already developed in the Apollo program.

The Sky Lab will be placed into earth orbit and each of three manned missions will rendezvous and dock with the workshop. The first of these missions will last for 28 days, and the second and third will each last for 56 days. According to the report of the House Space Committee, these missions "are a prelude to the operation of a space station and space shuttle" and their "greatest importance will be to demonstrate during long duration manned flights the interassociation of man and his experiments."

These Sky Lab missions are crucial to the future of long-duration manned space flight. For after hearing the testimony of a series of medical experts, the House Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications found that "the warning flags are already flying" with respect to the possible deleterious effects on men exposed to the hazards of long duration flight. The subcommittee's report came to the following conclusion:

The ability to predict man's enduring tolerance to the environment of space, particularly prolonged weightlessness, is limited. The consensus is that current knowledge based on flights up to 14 days is adequate to proceed with planning the proposed 28-day Sky Lab mission. But it is illogical to conclude from the results of successful short flights that long duration flights can be scheduled without risk of unacceptable consequences. Accordingly, present knowledge is considered inadequate to safely proceed with the proposed 56-day flight, or longer flights to the planets, without adequate testing and satisfactory monitoring of astronauts on the 28-day flights, in carefully planned scientific experiments beyond any yet undertaken in manned flight.

In short, until this Sky Lab experiment is completed in 1973, we will not know whether or not man will be able to use the shuttle/station. If the Sky Lab missions demonstrate that man cannot operate effectively in space for long periods of time, then the enormous funds allocated for the space shuttle/station will have been wasted—regardless of whether the expenditure is labeled as a "study" or as development.

And even if it is demonstrated that man can survive in such an environment, the station will undoubtedly have to be tailored to solve various biomedical problems. It is therefore senseless to spend millions of dollars on design and definition before we know the answers to these problems.

As one Congressman noted, it is strange, indeed, to begin funding for a giant space station before we have even flown the small one which is supposed to test the concept of space station flight.

In addition to the unknowns about man's adaptability to long-duration space flight, extremely complex technical problems are posed by the shuttle and station. NASA acknowledges that design and development of the shuttle represents a new and formidable technical challenge, which will require maximum

innovation on the part of the aerospace industry. Congressman KARTH pointed out that before the space shuttle can become a reality, many difficult technological advances must occur in such areas as configuration and aerodynamics, heat protection, guidance and control, and propulsion. As a result of these technical complexities, a recent issue of *Aviation Week and Space Technology* notes that:

There has developed within NASA a schism in approach to design-in size, configuration and operational requirements.

NASA originally planned to complete design and definition of the shuttle in 11 months. But according to recent news stories, this phase of the shuttle has been extended by another 6 months or perhaps longer in order to solve any persistent problems.

If it is true, as NASA claims, that the space shuttle station is not a crash project, then the results of the Sky Lab experiments should be considered and these technical problems should be resolved before moving to design and definition.

Even if it is demonstrated that man can adapt to extended space flight and that these technical problems can be overcome, serious doubt remains about the wisdom of funding a space shuttle station. For this project will insure the continued dominance of manned flights over unmanned flights—despite the fact that there are many persons, both defenders and critics of the space program, who argue that this program must achieve a better balance between manned and unmanned flights.

For example, in remarks before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, the eminent space scientist, Dr. James A. Van Allen, stated.

If, on a purely pragmatic basis, one or more men in the spacecraft is the cost effective technique for conducting any one of these missions, let it be done in that mode.

But if, as I anticipate, this is not the case, let us not grieve nor devote ourselves to the invention of specious and inane reasons to the contrary. Rather let us get on with our . . . objectives in the most sensible and rational framework that we can devise.

Brian O'Leary, a former scientist, astronaut, and now an astronomy professor at Cornell, recently wrote that—

We should encourage science looking for a mission rather than a mission looking for science; we should ask how we can best perform a mission manned or unmanned, not what we can do with the man.

In these times of conflicting, uncertain goals both inside and outside NASA, I think the unmanned planetary program provides a good example of what can be done. The Mariner 6 and 7 flyby missions gave us remarkable pictures and valuable scientific information, yet each cost less than 15 percent of the price of sending two test pilots to the moon.

And Max Born, a distinguished physicist and Nobel Prize winner, has commented that the manned space program was a "triumph of intellect but a failure of reason." To him, the manned missions are senseless, because their cost so far outweighs their scientific value and the money is so badly needed elsewhere.

NASA has, in effect, ignored this type of criticism and is making no effort to

redress the present imbalance between manned and unmanned flights. While NASA's projected budgets go from \$4 billion in fiscal year 1972 to \$6.8 billion in fiscal year 1979, the unmanned effort will remain at a constant level. NASA would like to see us spend \$6.8 billion starting in 1979. I wonder how much they have programed for 1984. In fiscal year 1979, it is estimated that 68 percent of NASA's total budget will be spent on manned flight missions—including the space shuttle/station and the planning for a manned Mars landing.

Because of NASA's preoccupation with manned flights to the detriment of scientific investigation, an impressive group of scientists have already resigned from the space program. This list includes the chief scientist, the director of the Lunar Receiving Laboratory, the principal investigator of Apollo lunar surface geology, the curator of the lunar samples, and two scientist-astronauts.

Mr. President, I am about to read from letters I have just received from nationally recognized space scientists criticizing the manned flight programs.

From this whole pattern comes a clear and unavoidably clear conclusion that in the space program, the scientists themselves have lost the battle.

This is now no longer a scientific space program. It is a program by and for the space agency and the space industries which produce manned flight equipment.

I hate to make that charge, but I think the evidence from the resignations and the projected budget of NASA can lead to no other conclusion.

I think that if we continue on the course recommended by the Space Agency, it will be one of the most inexcusably wasteful programs ever conducted in the history of the United States.

It seems to me that it would be unwise to proceed further, especially at a time when we are confronted with so many overwhelming domestic problems.

I go through my State—north and south and east and west—and I hear the same problems mentioned that all of my colleagues do.

They mention the problems of inflation, unemployment, housing, decent farm prices, and the exploding cities all around the Nation.

Not once has a constituent come up to me and said, "We need a space shuttle station."

No one has said that except the manufacturers and the space agency. They are looking for something to do now that the manned lunar project is coming to an end.

I suggest that there is a better need for this money—an expenditure of \$14 billion by NASA's own estimates—and it certainly will exceed that by several percentage points if our space experiences have taught us anything at all.

For all of these reasons, then, I believe that we should prohibit the use of any funds for design and definition of the space shuttle/station—pending the completion of the Sky Lab missions, the solution of technical problems, and a complete examination of the proper balance between manned and unmanned flights in the space program of the future. If

we fail to do so, we will have missed a unique opportunity to reassess our entire space program.

It should be emphasized that the decision to delete funds for design and definition of the space shuttle/station will not kill the project. NASA officials have testified that approximately \$80 million will be spent during fiscal year 1971 in direct support of this project by NASA's Office of Advance Research and Technology. This research is aimed at solving the difficult technical problems presented by the space shuttle/station.

Before undertaking the design and development of this project, we should first determine whether OART can resolve some of these technical difficulties.

It should also be kept in mind that deferring this project will not put an end to space exploration. The United States can have a meaningful and worthwhile space program in the next decade based upon existing technology and equipment.

But since the space shuttle/station involves the development of new technology and new equipment, it requires careful scrutiny. It is proposed as our next major effort in manned space flight—and it comes at a time of growing doubt in the scientific community about the value of future manned space flights, and at a time of even greater doubt about a manned flight to Mars.

Yet, there has been virtually no national debate as to whether our Government should undertake such a program.

I am convinced that if the American people understand the full implications of this space shuttle/station, they will decide that it is not in our national interest to proceed with the program at this time.

For, in the end, it comes down to a question of priorities. It is interesting to note that the report of the House Space Committee, in describing the space station, stated that its "living quarters will be attractive and comfortable." At a time when millions of Americans are living in substandard and rat-infested dwellings which are not "attractive and comfortable," it seems senseless to spend billions of dollars erecting decent housing hundreds of miles from earth.

I referred earlier to letters which I had received from some of the top scientists in the field. I received one from Dr. Van Allen, who is at the University of Iowa, after whom the Van Allen Belt has been named. He is one of the Nation's most prestigious scientists. He is consultant to the Space Sciences Board of the National Academy of Science, a consultant to the President's Science Advisory Board, discoverer of the Van Allen Radiation Belt in space, and chairman of the Department of Physics and Astronomy of the University of Iowa.

In his letter he says:

On these grounds I hold that large-scale engineering studies looking toward the development of a space shuttle are not sufficiently well-grounded in purpose or significance to justify a substantial commitment of national resources at this time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from Dr. Van Allen printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA,
Iowa City, Iowa, June 29, 1970.

HON. WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I am writing to give you my views on the proposed space shuttle program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as outlined in testimony before the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the United States Senate on 20 and 27 February 1970.

During over 24 years of professional experience in space research, I have come to the considered view that automated, commandable space equipment provides a much more economical method than do manned systems for the conduct of both utilitarian and scientific missions. Nothing within the Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo programs has changed my mind. On the contrary they have reinforced my stand in a massive way.

The current and proposed space shuttle studies are being conducted on a competent engineering basis and may very well demonstrate the technical feasibility of developing such a system for \$6,000,000,000 or thereabouts.

The real questions are, however, the following:

(a) Do manned systems possess any unique, useful capabilities in space that an unmanned system can not be built to possess?

(b) Are manned systems at present or in the foreseeable future economically competitive for any specific purposes with automated, commandable systems?

(c) Can men operate alertly, intelligently, and healthfully for long periods of space flight?

I believe that the answers to Questions (a) and (b) are almost certainly "No". The answer to Question (c) is still unclear.

On these grounds I hold that large scale engineering studies looking toward the development of a space shuttle are not sufficiently well grounded in purpose or significance to justify a substantial commitment of national resources at this time.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. VAN ALLEN,
Head of Department.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota on an excellent speech.

The Senator said that in going around his State, Minnesotans were saying that they need better farm programs, better housing programs, and better education programs. I find the same thing in my State.

The Senator pointed out that no one in his State had told him that our country needs a space shuttle or space station.

I suppose that one can say that only the scientists can appreciate the scientific value of this work. Yet the Senator from Minnesota documented the fact that scientists themselves are opposed to the expenditure of this money.

I think that this is certainly not the way to spend our money in space. We ought to spend it in unmanned exploration rather than in manned exploration—manned exploration is more glamorous but does not have the same payoff.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Dr. W. Ross Adey, director of the space biology laboratory

at the University of California at Los Angeles.

He was the principal investigator for NASA for the Biosatellite III program.

That is the mission that was aborted when the monkey died after 8½ days of flight.

Dr. Adey concludes in his very strong letter that the space program has become overwhelmed by the manned space lobby and by the so-called engineering efforts of this kind, and that scientists and scientific efforts have been largely diminished.

He concludes in this way:

Therefore, it is submitted that the program for a Space Shuttle might well remain in the phase of fundamental research and feasibility studies, pending the outcome of medical investigations in the Skylab program. At the same time, avoiding commitment to heavy expenditure in this area would afford an excellent opportunity to redress the traditional imbalance between manned spaceflight programs and other more modest but highly important developments. These include fundamental space biology related to medical problems of man in space, and studies in the physical sciences in planetary programs, as well as in areas of the NASA Space Applications program.

I will not take the time of the Senate to read the entire letter. However, this is one of the most highly regarded and experienced scientists this Nation has, and he is writing and asking us to strike this program.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island finds himself in a rather awkward position, not only with reference to managing the bill, but also with regard to this particular amendment and several other amendments that will be proposed during the progress of debate. Other members of our committee will rise to take the opposite view.

If the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota comes to a vote I propose to vote for the amendment. I so notified the Senator and the committee.

When the matter came up in committee it was soundly defeated. As a matter of fact, on the authorization it was beaten by a vote of 56 to 29, I think. The Senator from Minnesota is renewing his request for the elimination of this program. As I have said to Dr. Paine and to many of my colleagues, that this is not only the age of Aquarius, but it is also the age of priorities.

Whether or not there is a scientific feasibility here, of course, remains to be seen. I think our scientific community is able to accomplish anything that is possible. We proved it when we went to the moon.

President John Kennedy came before a joint session of Congress and said that we would go to the moon in 10 years. There was not a Congressman there who did not throw his hat in the air. Well, we did go to the moon and came back. We picked up a few rocks, and we went again and picked up a few more rocks. Now, we know the world and these rocks are 1 billion years old; maybe we will find

that they are 5 billion years old. How far that will go in feeding the hungry, housing the unsheltered, and cleaning the pollution on man's earth is hard to determine.

I am not against the space program but I do think the space program should be placed in its proper perspective. So here we are. What are we going to do about urban renewal; and what are we going to do about legislation for sewage disposal in some of our rural areas? We have all these other priorities. I think we need to orient the space program according to our needs.

I am afraid some of our colleagues who are for the space program get the idea that every time we want to cut out a nickel from the budget request on NASA it is doing the entire scientific community and the space program a disservice. That is not intended by anyone.

This bill provides for \$3½ billion, which is a lot of money. It is true the amount is one-half of what it was 5 or 6 years ago. Well, 5 or 6 years ago we had not gone to the moon and the whole program was geared to going to the moon. No one found fault with that, but now we have been to the moon twice.

I said before the committee, "Thank God, we were able to bring those men back on Apollo 13 when things went wrong." But I am afraid, judging from the investigation made on that abortive moon shot, that we must analyze what we have been doing. I think we are going a little too fast and biting off more than we can chew. I think we should more or less de-escalate our outer space activity and escalate a little more on space activity, because not only is space closer to man and his problems on earth, but we also have communications, aerospace, and all these other matters that are closer to us and have a greater impact on man's happiness, his welfare, and his well-being.

The House cut the budget of the President's Space Council by \$160,000 but we restored it in committee. The Space Council which is now headed by Astronaut Anders, who pledged to me that he is going to be absolutely independent and that he is going to take a good look at this matter of priorities in space. We expect some very good recommendations from him.

All I have to say, and I think the most dramatic argument made by the Senator from Minnesota, is that it is not so much that this is not feasible, but can this not wait a little longer? Could we not use this money to build homes for those who need them, to clear the air where it is needed, to clean up our waters, which need it so much, and all the other things to help men here on earth?

I am afraid if NASA keeps going at the rate it is going it is going to hurt itself. On Apollo 13 NASA could hardly get anyone interested in what was going on. It was only when the astronauts became involved in that near tragedy and had to be brought back to earth that America became conscious of what was going on and we fixed our eyes on television screens all over again. But I remember people were becoming more or less disenchanted. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that when one walks down the street in

Providence, R.I., and talks to the people, they are not against the space program, but they do want to know why. At the pace we are going, even though it is less than it was a year ago, the fact remains it is over \$3 billion.

While we do not want to injure the program, at the same time we should keep our priorities in proper focus, and I think this is one program that can wait. This is what I asked Mr. Paine when he came before our committee. I asked if this is a dream in the scientist's eye or does there appear to be something desirable in this. He gave me a long answer and said that if we do what we have to do, and do that design and that design, it might be feasible.

However, the fact remains that at one time we had the ANP program to build a nuclear engine for an airplane. After we had spent millions of dollars we asked, "Who can stay up that long?" You could not keep a man up that long so we discarded the program. Then, we had the C-5A program. Senators remember the argument on the floor of the Senate.

I hope in this case we do not spend \$110 million and decide next year to cut it out anyway. That has been the argument that has been made: If we find it is not feasible we can cut it back. If that is an argument to save money, I do not know.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. I think it is important to point out that when the word "science" is used, the most recognized independent scientists in this country all say we do not know if it is going to work or not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one comment?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am reminded of what happened in connection with the ABM. When Mr. Foster was pressed as to whether any scientists outside the Pentagon approved that plan he named some. Those two men, Dr. Keller and Dr. Weinberger, came to our committee and they said Mr. Foster was completely mistaken and they did not believe it would do what the Pentagon expected. In other words, there was a direct contradiction in that testimony.

Mr. MONDALE. I suspect there is a relationship between the people who want to build the ABM and those who want to build the space shuttle station. They are pressing hard for these programs.

But that does not mean that it is not the responsibility of the Senate to impose priorities on what is most important.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree completely with what the Senator said and I believe the Senator from Rhode Island said it extremely well. I shall certainly support them.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I would like to read from this additional letter from Dr. Thomas Gold, who is director of the Center for Radio-physics and Space Research for Cornell University.

He is not merely a scientist; he is

Chairman of the ad hoc Space Science Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee, consultant to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and a member of the NASA Lunar and Planetary Missions Board. He writes a very strong letter opposed to the expenditure of \$100 million on this space shuttle program. He says this, among other things:

Manned earth orbital flight is of very doubtful value for either science or applications. The prestige value, once no doubt very great, is by now very low also and will not be heightened very much by merely increasing the number of men or the size of the ship.

When the success of the first Apollo landing had been achieved and when the end of the program was in sight, the whole question of the justification for a large manned operation should have been reviewed. The inertia of a large organization is a poor reason for the continuation of a program. I am sure this view is shared by most of the scientific community and even by many people within NASA. The argument only has been—

I would like to underscore this—

The argument only has been that the availability of funds is so dependent on the popular appeal of manned flight that the alternatives were to do a job that is worth doing by uneconomical means or not at all.

In other words, this is a top space scientist saying that relying on the manned flight program is the only way money can be wrenched out of Congress, even though manned flights are uneconomical.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in supporting the argument of the Senator from Rhode Island, with which I agree, I point out that he asked, "Why can't this wait?"

I would like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if it is not true that the space program, and particularly this program, might be better served if we did wait because of the fact that the Russian flight, the Soyuz flight, as well as the other flights the Senator from Minnesota referred to, indicate it is very possible, and perhaps even likely, that if man goes into space for any substantial length of time, it might have very serious adverse physiological effects on him. The findings indicate that the men in flight had some cardiovascular problems and weight loss. This is certainly a problem to be looked into to ascertain the results on man if he should stay up long enough to make this space shuttle program worthwhile. We have a Skylab experimentation program that could give us answers before we go ahead with this expensive space shuttle project.

Mr. MONDALE. We are in a difficult position in that NASA is seeking a space lab experimentation for the year 1972-73 to determine biomedical facts necessary for long duration space flights—to determine if such flight is indeed possible. And at the same time there is a request for \$110 million to design a space vehicle before we know whether such flight is possible. That is set forth in a

letter from Mr. Adey, who is in charge of UCLA's space biology lab. We are asked to provide \$110 million, which we should not do until we know the results of the Skylab experiment. How can we provide \$110 million for a given design when we do not know if it is possible to do it?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It may be \$110 million this year, and \$220 million next year, and then we may have to stop the program because we find that man cannot live under those conditions.

Mr. MONDALE. That is right.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Senators have urged us to support this program with the argument that it has international benefit, that it is not a program which has any peculiar benefit to the United States of America, and we ought to get international participation. We had been told over and over again, when we tried to get that cooperation on the moon shots, but that we had gone so far along on the program, and in view of the fact that only three astronauts were involved, it was not practical to get European countries to participate and to pay for the program. Now, I am told, there is great interest in this program on the part of western European countries, but if we go ahead and make this investment in the program, once again we will be told, "We have put up all the money and it is too late for them to come in." So here is another reason why it would be wise to postpone a program of this kind, costing \$110 million, until we can determine whether or not we can get international participation.

Mr. MONDALE. No doubt it will be recalled that at the time we debated the issue during consideration of the authorization bill, mention was made that it would be a wonderful program for the Russians to participate in. The question was asked, "Has anybody asked the Russians if they want to cooperate?" No one had asked the Russians. It would be unrealistic to think, after we have spent \$30 million on the program and the Russians had not participated with us, that suddenly, we might want to ask the Russians to cooperate. That is just dreaming.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I recall there was argument in the Appropriations Committee that the main benefit of this program would be military. I recall arguing that, from my standpoint, the military argument might be a telling and persuasive one if we could get a convincing documentation to that effect. But the fact is that if this program were primarily of military benefit, then it ought to come in the defense appropriations; second, the military has rejected a similar program, the manned orbiting lab, on the ground that it was not of sufficient consequence to be included even in a \$70 billion budget.

It is true that there was some testimony, in the voluminous hearings, indicating that this space shuttle/station might be of military value, but the argument was generalized and not specific. There was no indication that I could get of what the particular benefits would be to us either from an intelligence or any other standpoint in the military area. Military value may be a persuasive argu-

ment, but this Senator cannot buy it until I know just how, when, where this military value is. I hope we have not reached the point where a Senator simply says military and receives \$110 million for a project. And that is the case here.

On the question of military intelligence this may make the investment worthwhile. But we are not getting such a justification now. If it is of military value, we should ask the Defense Department to pay for it, and why should not the military be running it? On the other hand, if it is just a generalized and vague potential for the military not sufficient for the Defense Department to invest its own funds in, then it seems to me we are right in rejecting the argument that it is of military value.

Mr. MONDALE. As to the argument about international cooperation, we ought to know that there is a good reason for other nations to cooperate and participate in the cost of this program. It seems to me when \$14 billion is being requested, we ought to have something more substantial than vague comments. The same applies with reference to the defense dimensions of the problem. That seems to be without basis.

As the Senator from Wisconsin pointed out, the Defense Department effort in this field, which was the manned orbiting lab, was eliminated by the Department itself as one of the most useless expenditures in its total budget. It cut out the manned orbiting lab.

In addition, NASA and the Department of Defense have often cooperated on space programs which had both civilian and defense factors involved. In this case, the Defense Department is not putting up one penny for the development or design of a space shuttle program. If the Defense Department thought it was important in the military sense, surely, as we have seen in the past, it would be very much interested.

This shows in perhaps a more eloquent way what the Defense Department really thinks about the military implications of the space shuttle station program. Also, I am told that the Defense Department made the decision that they could learn more from instrumented surveillance and other kinds of space vehicles than from these kinds of manned laboratories in space—once again showing that not only in the pure science field, but in the defense field as well, the advantages are to be found in unmanned instrumental flight, rather than in these doubtful, uneconomical, and dangerous long-duration manned flights.

I quote from the letter of Professor Gold, of Cornell. He said:

The biomedical problems of prolonged space flight are almost certainly severe. The fact that short duration flights have not incapacitated men seriously must not be taken to mean that very long duration flights will be safe. The indications are indeed that major problems do arise, and medical science cannot at the present time foresee their solution. From this point of view also it would be foolish to commit large sums to the development of space technology for long duration manned flights, which it may then not be possible to undertake.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at

this point the letter of July 3, 1970, from Prof. Thomas Gold, of the Center for Radiophysics and Space Research, Cornell University, and the letter dated June 20, 1970 from Dr. W. Ross Adey, director, Space Biology Laboratory, University of California at Los Angeles.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORNELL UNIVERSITY, CENTER FOR
RADIOPHYSICS AND SPACE
RESEARCH,

Ithaca, N.Y., July 3, 1970.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: This is to present briefly my views as to the future importance to exploration, science, and technological development of manned and of unmanned, instrumented space flight.

1. The exploration and science of the planets is, in the foreseeable future, wholly in the hands of the unmanned instrumented space program.

The reason for this is that space flight by means of the presently known technology to the planet Mars will involve a round trip of more than 1½ years. This is so far removed from present day capabilities, and the uncertainties of prolonged manned space flight are so great, that no space program at the present time should be based on such a prospect. The suggestion that this prospect is a driving force behind the present space program has been made, but it is, in my view, irresponsible.

Planets other than Mars have circumstances that make a manned visit quite impracticable, and for the most part much longer travel times still would be involved. Asteroids and the satellites of the major planets are, it is true, no more inhospitable than the moon, but both because of their distance and the smaller intrinsic interest they have for us, the prospect for a manned visit is even smaller than for Mars.

On the other hand, complex remotely controlled instrumentation can be devised and is indeed being devised to perform almost all the actions in a remote location that a man could perform working under the constraints of space or Martian environment. One foresees a very successful period of instrumented discoveries in space, perhaps in the long run of great value to mankind.

2. Manned earth orbital flight is of very doubtful value for either science or applications. The prestige value, once no doubt very great, is by now very low also and will not be heightened very much by merely increasing the number of men or the size of the ship.

Many attempts have been made to find real uses for a group of men in earth orbital flight, but these have largely failed. Man in a spaceship is capable only of a rather limited and well-defined set of actions, and almost in all cases remote control mechanisms can be provided whereby all the information that would be available to him is equally available to the man on the ground, and whereby the actions that he could have taken can equally be initiated by the man on the ground. The man on the ground has, so to speak, remote eyes and hands in the space vehicle.

It is my opinion that all scientific experiments proposed for earth orbit can be done both more cheaply and better with suitable instruments. Repair and updating of expensive instruments is the one area where the methods of remote control would have to be advanced the most before they would be superior to the presence of a man in the remote location. Economically this will not make a case for a large manned space flight program. In any case, the remote control can be improved to take over this activity also.

3. The Apollo program was devised firstly as a great demonstration of capability and secondly for the exploration of the moon. Once this decision was taken, there was no point in competing in the lunar exploration with remotely controlled instrumentation. There will be good reasons, however, in continuing the exploration of the moon by unmanned devices at the end of the Apollo program.

When the success of the first Apollo landing had been achieved and when the end of the program was in sight, the whole question of the justification for a large manned operation should have been reviewed. The inertia of a large organization is a poor reason for the continuation of a program. I am sure this view is shared by most of the scientific community and even by many people within NASA. The argument only has been that the availability of funds is so dependent on the popular appeal of manned flight that the alternatives were to do a job that is worth doing by uneconomical means or not at all. That of course is a situation which the Congress could rectify.

4. Money spent on manned and on unmanned space flight has totally different consequences for general technological evolution and the economy. A large fraction of the money spent on manned flight goes into devising very large vehicles and the environment required by man. Comparatively little of this technology is applicable in other fields.

Sophisticated instrumentation, complex electronics, computers and remote control devices appear now to be the major line of evolution of technology, an evolution that promises to improve greatly all of industry. The economic value of these advances will be immense, and the leadership of the United States in these areas is essential if the country is to remain the major economic and military power in the world. The space program has significantly contributed in the last ten years to this technological evolution, and a large instrumented space program would be a decisive factor in the future.

In the field of economically valuable applications no case has been made for manned flight. Communication satellites and, before very long, direct broadcasting and TV to the individual consumer would provide a very large political and economic stimulus for instrumented space technology. Meteorological satellites and other sensing systems from orbit will of course also improve, but almost certainly without any need for the presence of a man in orbit.

5. The biomedical problems of prolonged space flight are almost certainly severe. The fact that short duration flights have not incapacitated men seriously must not be taken to mean that very long duration flights will be safe. The indications are indeed that major problems do arise, and medical science cannot at the present time foresee their solution. From this point of view also it would be foolish to commit large sums to the development of space technology for long duration manned flights, which it may then not be possible to undertake.

I hope these remarks are helpful to you, and I would of course be happy to give you and your colleagues in Congress more details and substantiation for them if this were desired.

Yours sincerely,

T. GOLD,
Director.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
LOS ANGELES,
June 29, 1970.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: With Senate action now pending on the Space Shuttle, I

submit for your consideration the following viewpoints as important in the determination of priorities in the space program in the coming decade. I write as a concerned biomedical scientist who has participated in the space program for the past ten years, both as an investigator in manned and unmanned flights, and as a member of committees and review bodies with an advisory role to both government and NASA.

Priorities in the space program since its inception have placed major emphasis on manned programs, with particular emphasis on the engineering aspects of needed hardware for reliable mission accomplishment. Although there can be no quarrel with the development of spacecraft engineering with reliability assured for manned flight, the price paid has been very high, so high that it appears to have been markedly detrimental to a balance between manned and unmanned space developments. Moreover, emphasis within the manned program has been on man as a test pilot in evaluation of engineering goals, rather than as a biological system himself, requiring the same careful long-term and detailed evaluation if the goal of long-term space flight is to be accomplished.

Biomedical information currently available is not adequate in critically important areas for the design or construction of space stations or interplanetary spacecraft. Specifically, we do not know whether it will be necessary to provide artificial gravity by some form of rotation of part or all of the spacecraft. Biomedical evidence from the U.S. manned program, and particularly from the recent U.S. monkey biosatellite flights, and from the Soviet Soyuz-9 manned flight, all indicate that there are significant problems of cardiovascular instability, body weight loss, and associated disturbances in daily body rhythms and certain nervous functions.

Yet to build spacecraft with a full artificial gravity as on earth, provided by rotation, predicates systems of very large dimensions for acceptable human comfort. Moreover, levels of gravity much less than 1 G may be adequate to prevent medical deterioration, and it is possible that drug and hormone therapy, properly developed, may greatly assist on long missions.

No adequate biomedical basis for these engineering systems is now available, either in the NASA or in the biomedical community. Therefore, it is imperative that NASA collect comprehensive biomedical data as an engineering baseline for design of future spacecraft for prolonged human occupancy.

It is here that there are grounds for concern. NASA has a long history of making commitments to biomedical investigations, which have been repeatedly reduced or even shelved in favor of mission goals of a primarily engineering character. The proposed medical studies in the Skylab missions were initially designed to overcome many deficiencies in the current status of space medicine and physiology. Every effort should be made to safeguard the prime importance of the biomedical aspects of these missions.

In this context, development of a Space Shuttle should be reviewed in terms of its potential contribution to acquisition of needed biomedical information. Its use as an adjunct to physical and life science investigations should be evaluated against likely progress of biomedical research in the Skylab program in the absence of such a vehicle. Medical and psychological studies planned for Skylab will provide much needed information relevant to design of spacecraft for prolonged human occupancy. They are expected to settle many basic issues concerning needs for artificial gravity.

Therefore, it is submitted that the program for a Space Shuttle might well remain in the phase of fundamental research and feasibility studies, pending the outcome of medical investigations in the Skylab pro-

gram. At the same time, avoiding commitment to heavy expenditure in this area would afford an excellent opportunity to redress the traditional imbalance between manned spaceflight programs and other more modest but highly important developments. These include fundamental space biology related to medical problems of man in space, and studies in the physical sciences and planetary programs, as well as in areas of the NASA Space Application program.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

W. ROSS ADEY, M.D.

Director, Space Biology Laboratory.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, if there was ever \$100 million that could be cut painlessly from a \$200 billion budget, this is it. It is, in my opinion, without redeeming features. It would call for the design, at a cost of \$110 million, of a project about which the top scientists in this country are doubtful. The \$110 million is for the beginning of a program which will cost at least \$14 billion. It seems to me that our resources should be spent in meeting our real human needs—not in this highly wasteful and doubtful space effort.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator intend to ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment?

Mr. MONDALE. Yes, Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MONDALE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, we are arguing again the question that was brought up by my able friend the Senator from Minnesota at the time of the passage of the authorization bill. This question was debated at great length at that time, and the Senator's position was rejected by the Senate by a vote of 56 to 29.

I understand that the present amendment, while, of course, in different words, relates to exactly the same matter. It proposes to reduce the appropriations for NASA by about \$110 million, to use a general figure, coupled with additional wording in the bill to prevent the use of any other NASA appropriations for the space shuttle program, if I am correct in my understanding.

Mr. MONDALE. There will be \$80 million in this bill—which is not being contested—for general research on the space shuttle station program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Well, on the other provision that was inserted, in addition to the \$110 million being cut off, which is put in for the research on the space shuttle, the wording reads as follows:

Provided, that this appropriation shall not be available for the design or definition of any space shuttle or space station.

Mr. MONDALE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this is substantially the same question that we debated at length, that the Senate rejected as an amendment to the authorization bill by a vote of 56 to 29. I am not surprised at the Senator's bringing up the question again, because we all know of his perseverance. I have frequently had

occasion to congratulate him upon being persevering. But frankly, I cannot understand his doing it at this stage, when we have had a demonstration in the last few days of the fact that our friends the Soviets are working on exactly this same kind of proposal.

They put up a manned space flight, and kept it in flight several days longer than the longest one that we had had before, testing one of the things that would have to be tested before the space shuttle could become practicable, and that is whether or not men can live in space—in orbital space, not way out yonder, but nevertheless clear out of the atmosphere of the earth—for longer periods of time than had customarily been thought, or than had been tried.

We all know perfectly well that the long-continued journey through space by the two Russian astronauts, or cosmonauts, as they call them, which terminated only a few days ago, was precisely for that purpose, because after it was concluded and after it was a success, the Soviets announced that that was the purpose, and that it was a success, that it had shown that their cosmonauts—who are human beings just like American astronauts—could live and come back healthy from much longer periods of time weightlessness in outer space than had ever been shown to be the case before.

Now we are being asked to desert and forget about the only part of the space program which is designed to work toward that same end, by putting a space vehicle in orbit around the earth which can be used as a shuttle station, so that men can go there, can stay there long periods of time, and can be relieved, then, by others who will come back to earth in the same vehicle that took the reinforcements up.

The purpose of the space shuttle—and incidentally, this \$110 million does not commit us to it; it commits us to research to see whether it is possible or not, or whether there is reason to proceed with it, let us have that understood—has nothing to do with the projected trip to Mars or to outer space, which was argued quite extensively in the debate on the authorization bill. This has nothing to do with anything else than the question of whether or not we can have a laboratory moving out there around this earth at a reasonable distance, from which men can see and direct instruments, can see perfectly and can take pictures of any part of the earth which is visible, and can do any number of other things by way of communicating their information as well as the pictures of what they have discovered back to this earth.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. The question is whether or not we shall proceed with the research to determine whether such a laboratory is feasible, and whether it is feasible to have reusable space shuttles through which we will reduce enormously the cost of vehicles by which we send up men. They are not reusable now; they are throw-aways, and one of the principal objectives in the whole thing is to keep them from being throw-aways, and

to be able to use them over and over again, since they will be constructed of the most indestructible metals that have been found to be possible by way of alloying other well-known metals. Therefore, they can be reused, provided they can be returned, and go back and forth on repeated trips to the space laboratory.

Mr. MONDALE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Just one moment, and I shall be happy to yield.

That is the question. And when I get through with that part of the question, I want to go very fully into the connection with the defense effort, because there is a very real connection with the defense effort.

I heard one of my good friends, the Senator from Wisconsin, indicate that he thought it was a rather evanescent connection. I do not believe he used that word; he probably used a better word.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I concede that "evanescent" is a better word.

Mr. HOLLAND. What is that?

Mr. PROXMIER. I accept the Senator's word. I did not use it, but I think it characterizes well the nature of the connection.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought perhaps I was interpreting the Senator's meaning more correctly than his own wording had stated it. At any rate, that is the real meaning of the space shuttle—to reduce greatly the cost of sending men up and bringing them back by making the vehicle useful not just for one trip but for many, many return trips. The purpose of the research is to see whether that is feasible and also to see how feasible it is to keep the men up in the space laboratory for long periods of time.

As I have just remarked—and nobody can contradict me on it, because they all know it is true—the Russians have just demonstrated better than we have been able to demonstrate here before that man can live for much longer periods in a weightless condition and in orbit around the earth than we had up to this time believed was possible.

Before I go into the military aspects of the matter, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. I think that what the Soyuz-9 manned flight demonstrates is that there are serious questions surrounding the physiological capability of prolonged space flight by man.

Dr. Ross Adey, who was principal investigator of the Biosatellite III program, says this in his letter of June 29. He is Director of the Space Biology Laboratory at the University of California. He says:

Biomedical evidence from the U.S. manned program, and particularly from the recent U.S. monkey biosatellite flight, and from the Soviet Soyuz-9 manned flight, all indicate that there are significant problems of cardiovascular instability, body weight loss, and associated disturbances in daily body rhythms and certain nervous functions.

That was not the point I wish to make, however, when I rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought the Senator was rising for a question, but I am glad for him to go further.

Mr. MONDALE. I just wanted to make

that point, because I think Soyuz-9 strengthens the case against spending money for design for the space shuttle program at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. How many days longer did they stay up than anyone else before?

Mr. MONDALE. They were up for 18 days—4 days exceeding ours—and they experienced substantial physiological problems, as Dr. Adey points out.

The point I wanted to make concerns a fact that I think has to be clarified. The Senator from Florida has said that this \$110 million was for the purpose of continuing research to determine its feasibility. I regret to differ with the Senator from Florida. There is \$80 million in this appropriation which we are not seeking to delete, which is for the purpose of determining the research issues at stake surrounding the space shuttle station program.

In addition, there is the on-going Skylab program, to be completed in 1973—to determine, with existing equipment, the potential of man in long duration flight of up to 56 days. These expenditures will determine the possibilities of long duration manned flight and other questions concerning what must be done in the design of a space station in order to achieve long duration flight.

What I object to in this \$110 million is that it is for the purpose of developing a design, which is why our amendment says that none of this money may be used for the purpose of design or definition. I think that has to be clarified, because this \$110 million is not for research. It is for design and definition.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wanted to address myself to this. This is not design. I am afraid the Senator is in error. When I discuss this later, I will try to refer to the proper documents.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield further.

Mr. MONDALE. I am searching for the language which NASA itself uses. But this is for design and definition. It is not for research. There is \$80 million in this budget, which we are not seeking to delete, for the purpose of research. They have completed phase A, which they said determined the feasibility of the shuttle station, and they now want to move to phase B for the purpose of design and definition. So there is a fact issue that ought to be resolved. I think we went through it last time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, while the Senator is looking up the earlier debate, I will tell him that it is on page 14382 of the RECORD of May 6.

Mr. MONDALE. I am looking for the specific language of the NASA agency, which I hope to find in a moment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I will continue, and I will be glad to yield again to the Senator when he finds what he is searching for.

This very point was discussed in the debate we had during the authorization argument. The able Senator from Minnesota raised the exact point and had quite a discussion on it, on pages 14381

and 14382, in the debate of May 6. After the Senator from Minnesota had made a long statement on the matter, the Senator from Mississippi made this statement, which I think pretty well winds up the matter:

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator has made my point. The basic research will go on anyway, but it cannot be applied to the space shuttle, which cannot get the benefit of it, unless we have this program for the \$110 million. We will not get the benefit or the fruits of it. If we are to have this space system, we will have to move first into the field of definition studies.

And the Senator from Minnesota simply thanked the Senator from Mississippi for his explanation of the matter with these words:

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. I think that underscores my understanding of the debate. He is referring to the fruits that come from research, and he refers to the word "definition"; and earlier in the debate there is the colloquy about hardening of the design. That is what we were referring to, and it is this design and definition purpose for which the \$110 million is requested.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Minnesota, in his statement just before the Senator from Mississippi spoke, had this to say:

My argument is that until we have been satisfied in the research field, until we have seen whether it is feasible as a system which assumes man's capacity to survive long duration flights, we should withhold this kind of starter costs which we may not have to make if we find it to be infeasible.

In other words, the Senator from Minnesota took the position that until we found out how long man can live in space and whether long enough to justify the station and the shuttle service in which the vehicles would be used over and over again, we should not go into the question of the design of the platform. The Senator from Mississippi answered that, I thought, not only capably but also conclusively in what he had to say. Mr. President, there just is not any question about it—the Soviets as well as ourselves have been trying to find out how long men can exist in space with the best protection we are able to devise for them, without suffering too great results. The Russian experiment is the last one in that field and has shown that they can exist up to 4 days longer than was proven by us to be the case.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter dated July 6, 1970, from the Director of Space Medicine in NASA, Maj. Gen. J. W. Humphreys, Jr., admitting that they have not been able to get all the facts, because, as we know, our friends, the Russians, are not so frank with giving out facts to the world as we are.

But he does say that many things have been determined if only from the news media. I read a part of his letter:

At the present time, the only medical information on the results of Soyuz 9 which are available to us are those obtained from

the Russian and American news media. Information derived from the news media seem to indicate:

(1) The primary purpose of the mission was to evaluate the medical effects of manned space flight and test the life support system.

which is exactly what I have been saying awhile ago, that we have been trying to see how much longer we could go and which would be practical.

Continuing reading:

(2) A reduced coordination of eye movements and disturbances of color perception were reported, but apparently were not of sufficient magnitude to disturb visual performance. (We are unable to interpret the precise meaning of this statement at this time.)

(3) No significant impairment of health or performance occurred during the flight.

(4) Reports of post flight findings are meager, but seem to indicate a subjective feeling of heaviness immediately post flight and an alteration of cardiovascular responses for the first few days following the flight. (Both of these findings have been noted in our own astronauts. It is very likely that when we are able to compare the actual data, the Russian findings will approximate our own.)

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the whole letter from Maj. Gen. J. W. Humphreys, Jr., printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1970.

To: C/Assistant Administrator, Office of Legislative Affairs. Attn: Mr. Gerald J. Mossinghoff.

From: MM/Director of Space Medicine.

Subject: Medical Information on Soyuz 9.

At the present time, the only medical information on the results of Soyuz 9 which are available to us are those obtained from the Russian and American news media. Information derived from the news media seems to indicate:

(1) The primary purpose of the mission was to evaluate the medical effects of manned space flight and to test the life support system.

(2) A reduced coordination of eye movements and disturbances of color perception were reported, but apparently were not of sufficient magnitude to disturb visual performance. (We are unable to interpret the precise meaning of this statement at this time.)

(3) No significant impairment of health or performance occurred during the flight.

(4) Reports of post flight findings are meager, but seem to indicate a subjective feeling of heaviness immediately post flight and an alteration of cardiovascular responses for the first few days following the flight. (Both of these findings have been noted in our own astronauts. It is very likely that when we are able to compare the actual data, the Russian findings will approximate our own.)

At this point we are unaware of any exceptional or unanticipated findings derived from the Soyuz 9 medical findings. The only possible exception is the indication of the occurrence of visual changes which are presently not amenable to precise interpretation. We have, however, been proceeding for the past three years with plans to provide an inflight capability to examine visual function, together with a great many other measurements aboard our future manned space flight missions. Opinions of various Russian experts, as reported in Tass and Iz-

vestia, based on Soyuz 9, have varied considerably in their prognosis of man's ability to fly in a weightless environment for prolonged periods of time (one to 12 months and longer), but currently available medical information on Soyuz 9 provides no indication for altering our present approach to planning of future manned space flight.

J. W. HUMPHREYS, Jr.,
Major General, USAF, MC.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, apparently they are trying to find out as a preliminary to greater use of men, not in the distant outer space but in the space around the earth, how long men can survive without great disturbance of their bodily functions.

This last result was obtained by the Russians since our debate when we approved this amount by a vote of better than 2 to 1, as I remember it, which shows that we are finding out with each passing test that man can survive a little longer than any other machine known, not like the little monkey my friend from Minnesota refers to who could not survive very long because he lacked the intelligence to adapt himself to the conditions which arose while the flight was in progress.

Mr. President, as to the defense application, there is no question about the connection existing, because that was brought out clearly in testimony by Dr. Foster, Director, Defense Research and Engineering, the chief man for the Department of Defense research.

Let me read for the record portions of the Senate Space Committee hearing, on pages 880 and 881.

I am going to read some portions which were deleted because of secrecy—I cannot read what was deleted—but it will show how many matters there were which the Department of Defense thought were critically affected because of security so that they should be omitted from the hearing record.

It starts with the question by the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH), following the statement by Dr. Foster that the Manned Orbital Laboratory program of the Department of Defense was canceled at a total estimated saving of \$1.5 billion, as I recall the amount:

Senator SMITH of Maine. Perhaps for the record, Dr. Foster, you might give us in a little more detail, keeping the security aspects of the subject in mind, as to just how the Defense Department can see a possible future military use, for the space shuttle.

Dr. FOSTER. I would be very pleased to put that in the record.

This he did. These things do not appear in the record except as a sanitized version, but it speaks rather strongly for the value of the program.

Here is what Dr. Foster said further:

Once an economical and operationally effective STS is developed, we would expect to use it to launch essentially all DOD payloads into earth orbit. We hope thereby to reduce DOD launch costs by an order of magnitude.

Now, my friends who are undoubtedly led into this in their desire for economy, do not seem to realize that this is an economy effort, that this is the significant intention of this particular special

shuttle effort, to be able to use the vehicle over and over again and to use men in space for as long a period as is found to be safe to use them.

Now, continuing to read:

Not only will we economize from the point of view of reusable launch vehicles, but significant savings can accrue because repair and reuse of payloads will be possible and payload design criteria could become less stringent. In addition to all of this, we would expect to benefit from the STS technology resulting from NASA's development efforts.

Senator SMITH of Maine. As you were talking with Senator Cannon about consolidating need of various agencies, would not the shuttle be that one that Defense and NASA could agree upon?

Dr. FOSTER. Yes, Senator Smith, that is what I intended to point out.

Mr. President, that concludes the sanitized statement that was placed in the record, showing the importance to the Department of Defense of the space shuttle effort.

Now, maybe our friends do not think there is any saving of money in combining an expensive program which the Department of Defense was operating, which was known as the MOL, with another expensive program which NASA is planning or doing the research for; but I cannot agree with that at all, and I do not believe, on sober reflection, that my friend from Minnesota would agree.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. Is the Defense Department at this time contributing any money to research on the space shuttle station program, either to NASA or in cooperation with NASA?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not to my knowledge. I believe that the understanding was on agreeing that the MOL should be abandoned after it had spent so many millions of dollars on it. I see that the distinguished Senator from Nevada is in the Chamber, and he is a member of the Armed Services Committee, as well as being a distinguished man in aviation. He will be able to correct me if I am wrong about it, but they decided that it was much sounder to have one agency do the research with both having the advantage of that research. The sanitized statement placed in the record by Dr. Foster says:

Once an economical and operationally effective STS is developed, we would expect to use it to launch essentially all DOD payloads into earth orbit.

If that does not sound like cooperation for the common use of a space system once it is determined to be feasible and then constructed for launch services, then I do not know how words can be found to state that.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, did DOD testify in favor of the \$110 million for design and definition of the space shuttle?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe they did. The whole question is further discussed in the record. I have not had a chance to review it entirely this morning. But I believe that was Dr. Foster's purpose. His main purpose in coming was to make it clear that the Department of Defense

wanted this particular program to go ahead and wanted the research work on it done.

I will continue to read, and perhaps we will find the specific wording.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am not objecting to the research. But I am objecting to the \$110 million in here for design and definition.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is not objecting to the research insofar as individuals are concerned and the effort to find out what conditions they can survive under and the like. But he is objecting to research which has to do with research on the kind of design which should be used, how it shall be launched, and how long its life is apt to be once launched into orbit and all of those questions that have to do with the space system, which are connected with the \$110 million.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this is a fundamental question. It seems to be a point of disagreement, not confusion, because the question of definition and design assumes a certain understanding about man's capacity for long duration flight.

Permit me to read a portion of the letter from Dr. Adey, director of the Space Biology Laboratory of the University of California at Los Angeles.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did the Senator not have that letter printed in the RECORD a while ago?

Mr. MONDALE. I did. But I want to make the distinction between definition and design. This is design money. There is research money provided in the bill.

Dr. Adey states:

Biomedical information currently available is not adequate in critically important areas for the design or construction of space stations or interplanetary space craft. Specifically, we do not know whether it will be necessary to provide artificial gravity by some form of rotation of part or all of the spacecraft. Biomedical evidence from the U.S. manned program, and particularly from the recent U.S. monkey biosatellite flight, and from the Soviet Soyuz-9 manned flight, all indicate that there are significant problems of cardiovascular instability, body weight loss, and associated disturbances in daily body rhythms and certain nervous functions.

Yet to build spacecraft with a full artificial gravity as on earth, provided by rotation, predicates systems of very large dimensions for acceptable human comfort. Moreover, levels of gravity much less than 1 G may be adequate to prevent medical deterioration, and it is possible that drug and hormone therapy, properly developed, may greatly assist on long missions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the Senator has overlooked the fact that the letter relates in part to research for interplanetary missions. The word was used in the letter.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, permit me to state his conclusion. I think that will clarify the matter.

He states:

Therefore, it is submitted that the program for a Space Shuttle might well remain in the phase of fundamental research and feasibility studies, pending the outcome of medical investigations in the Skylab program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD again.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, Calif., June 29, 1970.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: With Senate action now pending on the Space Shuttle, I submit for your consideration the following viewpoints as important in the determination of priorities in the space program in the coming decade. I write as a concerned biomedical scientist who has participated in the space program for the past ten years, both as an investigator in manned and unmanned flights, and as a member of committees and review bodies with an advisory role to both government and NASA.

Priorities in the space program since its inception have placed major emphasis on manned programs, with particular emphasis on the engineering aspects of needed hardware for reliable mission accomplishment. Although there can be no quarrel with the development of spacecraft engineering with reliability assured for manned flight, the price paid has been very high, so high that it appears to have been markedly detrimental to a balance between manned and unmanned space developments. Moreover, emphasis within the manned program has been on man as a test pilot in evaluation of engineering goals, rather than as a biological system himself, requiring the same careful long-term and detailed evaluation if the goal of long-term space flight is to be accomplished.

Biomedical information currently available is not adequate in critically important areas for the design or construction of space stations or interplanetary spacecraft. Specifically, we do not know whether it will be necessary to provide artificial gravity by some form of rotation of part or all of the spacecraft. Biomedical evidence from the U.S. manned program, and particularly from the recent U.S. monkey biosatellite flight, and from the Soviet Soyuz-9 manned flight, all indicate that there are significant problems of cardiovascular instability, body weight loss, and associated disturbances in daily body rhythms and certain nervous functions.

Yet to build spacecraft with a full artificial gravity as on earth, provided by rotation, predicates systems of very large dimensions for acceptable human comfort. Moreover, levels of gravity much less than 1 G may be adequate to prevent medical deterioration, and it is possible that drug and hormone therapy, properly developed, may greatly assist on long missions.

No adequate biomedical basis for these engineering systems is now available, either in the NASA or in the biomedical community. Therefore, it is imperative that NASA collect comprehensive biomedical data as an engineering baseline for design of future spacecraft for prolonged human occupancy.

It is here that there are grounds for concern. NASA has a long history of making commitments to biomedical investigations, which have been repeatedly reduced or even shelved in favor of mission goals of a primarily engineering character. The proposed medical studies in the Skylab missions were initially designed to overcome many deficiencies in the current status of space medicine and physiology. Every effort should be made to safeguard the prime importance of the biomedical aspects of these missions.

In this context, development of a Space Shuttle should be reviewed in terms of its potential contribution to acquisition of needed biomedical information. Its use as an adjunct to physical and life science investigations should be evaluated against likely

progress of biomedical research in the Skylab program in the absence of such a vehicle. Medical and psychological studies planned for Skylab will provide much needed information relevant to design of spacecraft for prolonged human occupancy. They are expected to settle many basic issues concerning needs for artificial gravity.

Therefore, it is submitted that the program for a Space Shuttle might well remain in the phase of fundamental research and feasibility studies, pending the outcome of medical investigations in the Skylab program. At the same time, avoiding commitment to heavy expenditure in this area would afford an excellent opportunity to redress the traditional imbalance between manned space-flight programs and other more modest but highly important developments. These include fundamental space biology related to medical problems of man in space, and studies in the physical sciences in planetary programs, as well as in areas of the NASA Space Applications program.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

W. ROSS ADEY, M.D.,
Director, Space Biology Laboratory
University of California at Los Angeles.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the letter expresses very clearly that it is directed in the main at interplanetary exploration and interplanetary flight and artificial gravity to be created by certain mechanical means in the event men are sent out into interplanetary spaces.

We are not talking about anything of that kind. We are talking plainly and simply about the research for and the design for the reusability of the craft after it is launched and the method of launch which would be different than anything we have ever had before. We are also talking about finding out whether it is feasible to have such a platform launched out in an area relatively close to earth, but nevertheless making constant orbits around earth.

The letter very clearly shows that the bulk of it has to do in the first instance with biomedical facts and in the second instance with interplanetary flight and preparations therefor.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will yield. I had promised to yield to the Senator from Florida. However, I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, one cannot clearly read the letter from Dr. Adey without concluding that earth orbiting is precisely what he is referring to.

Let me repeat:

Therefore it is submitted that the program for a Space Shuttle might well remain in the phase of fundamental research and feasibility studies, pending the outcome of medical investigations in the Skylab program.

That is the earth orbiting program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it seems clear to me that the Senator is overlooking entirely the earlier part of the letter in which he is talking about interplanetary flight.

Mr. MONDALE. And earth orbit.

Mr. HOLLAND. He is talking about the creation of artificial gravity which is so necessary in the case of interplanetary

flight. He is talking about things that have no relation at all to what we are talking about here, as well as making some mention of the things we do have great concern about in the bill. However, the Senator is, I think, overlooking entirely the fact that the letter from which he reads, written by Dr. Adey, refers to a much broader group of subjects than we are talking about at the present time.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, may I say that the problem of long-duration flight—either in earth orbit or interplanetary—is one about which we do not know the answers, as Dr. Adey says.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the problem is so different that in the case of earth orbit, we might be talking about a period of a few weeks and, in interplanetary flights, we might be talking about a period of a few years. The difference is so great that the two can hardly be mentioned as the same problem.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Florida makes an able case for the space shuttle and the very problem we are talking about, man's ability to live in space.

As I gathered from the colloquy between the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Minnesota, and earlier from the colloquy between the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Wisconsin, they try to shoot down the space shuttle on the point that man cannot live long in space. There is no evidence that that is so.

From all of our own space flights so far—and we have had men orbiting for up to 13 days in space—they have suffered no ill effects.

As far as we know from the recent Soviet space flight which has lasted for just short of 18 days, there were no ill effects.

The reports have been fragmentary, as the Senator pointed out, in the letter from the space medical doctor on this matter.

But the Russian news reports which I have checked, and checked recently while listening to the colloquy, are that the Russian cosmonauts are entirely well and did not suffer any ill effects that could have come from long space flight.

The point is that we are now obviously in the neighborhood of 3 or 4 weeks in space. We know that men can live and get along all right.

If we have the space shuttle and if men suffer ill effects in space, we can bring them back in whatever period is necessary.

Obviously, the space shuttle as far as manned space flights are concerned backs up the facts already in existence.

So, I think that the argument the opposition is making about the space shuttle on the basis that we do not know how long men can live in space falls of its own weight because the space shuttle, as specified in the sky lab, works so well that we can bring our people home and substitute new men. So, we can have continuous surveillance and observation of men in space.

That is a good reason why we ought to have a space shuttle.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Florida for bringing out that real and very worthwhile objective of the space shuttle; that is, the possibility of recovery, of relief given, and recovery made in the event something went wrong so that men in space could survive for the length of time they are able to survive, but still could not bring back their vehicle to the earth.

I do wish to correct one statement a while ago, which was a slight misstatement. I said in the authorization hearing this amendment was defeated by 2 to 1. The vote was 56 to 29, which is almost 2 to 1 but not quite 2 to 1.

I will continue to read from the hearings. The last question, I think, was by the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH). It must be remembered that she is the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services and the ranking minority member of the space committee as well. More than any one individual she has kept check on the cooperative aspect of the programs of DOD and NASA.

Senator SMITH of Maine. As you were talking with Senator Cannon about consolidating need of various agencies, would not the shuttle be that one that Defense and NASA could agree upon?

Dr. FOSTER. Yes, Senator Smith, that is what I intended to point out.

That is something they could cooperate on.

I see in the Chamber the distinguished Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) who had been questioning Dr. Foster in an earlier part of the hearing. The Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) was referring to an earlier series of questions and answers in which the Senator from Nevada had been questioning Dr. Foster. Am I correct in that?

Mr. CANNON. The Senator is correct. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. I have before me the agreement that was entered into between the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with the Department of the Air Force concerning the space transportation system.

The Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) seems to imply that perhaps the Air Force or DOD needs have not been considered as a part of this program, that this was something NASA was undertaking, independent and apart from the military services.

This document, and I shall ask that it be made a part of the RECORD, establishes an agreement between NASA and the Department of the Air Force, acting as the agent of DOD "to insure that the proposed national space transportation system will be of maximum utility to both NASA and the DOD." This agreement is signed by Dr. Paine, Administrator of NASA, and Robert C. Seamans, Jr., Secretary of the Air Force, and it is dated February 17, 1970.

The agreement merely delegates to NASA the authority to proceed on behalf of both agencies in an effort to consolidate and not have two parallel

programs going, but to get the job accomplished on behalf of both agencies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the agreement may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the agreement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE CONCERNING THE SPACE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

This document establishes an agreement between NASA and the Department of the Air Force, acting as the agent of DOD, to insure that the proposed National Space Transportation System will be of maximum utility to both NASA and the DOD.

I. OBJECTIVE OF THE SPACE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

The objective of the Space Transportation System (STS) is to provide the United States with an economical capability for delivering payloads of men, equipment, supplies, and other spacecraft to and from space by reducing operating costs an order of magnitude below those of present systems.

The program may involve international participation and use. The development of the STS will be managed by NASA. The project will be generally unclassified. For purposes of this agreement, the STS will consist of the earth-to-orbit space shuttle.

II. NASA/USAF STS COMMITTEE

A. Organization

In order that the STS be designed and developed to fulfill the objectives of both the NASA and the DOD in a manner that best serves the national interest, a NASA/USAF STS Committee is hereby established that will report jointly to the Administrator of the NASA and the Secretary of the Air Force. The Committee will consist of eight members, four to be appointed by the Administrator of the NASA and four to be appointed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The Co-Chairmen of the Committee will be the Associate Administrator for Manned Space Flight (NASA) and the Assistant Secretary for Research and Development (Air Force). Any proposal for changing the composition or functions of the Committee will be referred to the NASA Administrator and the Air Force Secretary for their joint consideration.

B. Function

The Committee will conduct a continuing review of the STS Program and will recommend steps to achieve the objectives of a system that meets DOD and NASA requirements. Specifically, the Committee will review and make recommendations to the Administrator of NASA and to the Secretary of the Air Force on the establishment and assessment of program objectives, operational applications, and development plans. This will include, but not be limited to: Development and operational aspects, technology status and needs, resource considerations, and interagency relationships.

THOMAS O. PAINE,
Administrator, NASA.

Date: 17 Feb. 1970.

ROBERT C. SEAMANS, JR.,
Secretary of the Air Force.

Date: Feb. 17, 1970.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada who, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, not only had knowledge of this agreement but of the fact that it was available publicly. I knew of the existence of the contract but I did not know if it could be made available publicly. I am very glad that it will be in the RECORD. I am sorry the Senator from Minnesota is

not in the Chamber at the present time. It makes clear that some 3 months prior to our hearings the agreement had been entered into whereby DOD had assigned to NASA the doing of the very work which would be interfered with if this \$110 million were cut out of the appropriations bill.

I shall continue to read from hearings where the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) was asking questions of Dr. Foster.

Senator SMITH of Maine. I gathered that is what you were talking about.

Dr. Foster, are you aware of the Budget Bureau request of the Defense Department and NASA to jointly prepare plans for possible further consolidation of the DOD Eastern Test Range and the NASA Cape Kennedy Space Center activities?

Dr. FOSTER. Yes, I am, Senator; and we are making that review now. The date by which we have to submit that study to the Bureau of the Budget is May 1, 1970.

Which was a few days after our hearing.

I shall read one more exchange because I think it is so very full of meaning.

Senator SMITH of Maine. Doctor, you spoke of these joint committees and joint effort and so forth, between DOD and NASA. Are you finding full cooperation in this, or is there any lack of it on either side?

Dr. FOSTER. The answer there is that we find full cooperation. I must say it is getting better as the budget gets tighter.

Senator SMITH of Maine. We have been asking this question for some years, and I never feel satisfied that there is the full cooperation that will bring about the results that some of us would like to see.

Dr. Foster, does the United States have a capability to detect whether a Soviet spacecraft carries nuclear weapons?

Dr. FOSTER. [Deleted.]

Senator SMITH of Maine. Is the Soviet [deleted] launch vehicle operational?

Dr. FOSTER. [Deleted.]

Senator SMITH of Maine. [Deleted.]

Dr. FOSTER. [Deleted.]

Senator SMITH of Maine. [Deleted.]

Dr. FOSTER. [Deleted.]

Senator SMITH of Maine. [Deleted.]

Dr. FOSTER. [Deleted.]

Senator SMITH of Maine. [Deleted.]

Dr. FOSTER. [Deleted.]

Senator SMITH of Maine. [Deleted.]

Dr. FOSTER. No.

The deletion of those questions and answers shows the importance to the security of our Nation, which is involved in this matter.

I would like to say to the Senator from Minnesota, who was called temporarily from the Chamber but who has now returned, that in his absence the distinguished Senator from Nevada placed in the RECORD the operational agreement between the Air Force, acting for DOD, and NASA, making a common program out of the space shuttle.

Mr. MONDALE. How much money does the Air Force contribute to that?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would be glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada if he knows the answer.

Mr. CANNON. I would assume they contribute nothing.

Mr. MONDALE. That is what I thought.

Mr. CANNON. DOD thought NASA was the organization to handle the project for both agencies. I assume all of the

appropriation would be through the authorizing agency, the agency that is made manager of the project.

Mr. MONDALE. I think there have been many cases in the past where DOD and NASA jointly funded efforts, but in this one, DOD thinks so little of the project they will not spend a penny on it.

Mr. CANNON. Does the Senator have the idea that DOD gets money from other sources? Do they have some source, other than NASA has to go to, to receive their money for these projects? If so, I would like to know what it is. I thought the money came from appropriations by the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. MONDALE. If DOD thought that there was a critical defense need, it was my impression they have been more than able to come to Congress and get as much money as they requested—but in this instance they even canceled the MOL program.

Mr. HOLLAND. This is a program which, if proved to be successful, would be eminently useful for civilian purposes. They would save the vehicles and make use of them time and time again. It would be useful from the standpoint of the Department of Defense for the same purpose. There is no reason in the world why NASA should not have been agreed upon as the agency to do this work because it was trying to effect a method of economy, which the Senator from Minnesota is now seeking to destroy if he puts off new work that needs to be by way of research to make this effort successful.

There is one more point I wish to make and then I shall be finished. Generally speaking, there are three steps in the construction of a space system.

One of them is research and feasibility, which is covered in the \$110 million. Second is detailed planning and preliminary design, which is also covered within that. The third, development and construction, which is not covered within it. We are not trying to commit ourselves to the latter at this time.

Of course, as the Senator knows, and as he has stated, and stated very properly, the research as to the ability of man to live, and under what kind of conditions he can live, and how long, in space, is something that is going on, not only in this particular program but in every other manned program of any great duration in which we are engaged.

I strongly hope that this amount will not be cut out of the appropriation. It seems to me that the Senate, having specifically approved this project, by a vote of 56 to 29, at the time of authorization, should feel even less inclined to approve the effort of the Senator from Minnesota, knowing that the latest Russian effort shows clearly, beyond any question, that they are experimenting in this same field—the biomedical part of it—and that they conducted a rather fine experiment, based upon what was released only recently, in keeping their two cosmonauts in space some 17 days-plus.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House

had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3592) to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, to clarify the provisions relating to custom slaughtering operations.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17548) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I find myself in a very peculiar position this afternoon, as ranking Republican member of the subcommittee, in being asked to take the position for the committee of carrying the opposition to this amendment. I realize the feelings of the distinguished chairman of the committee. Nevertheless, I feel that this is a very important program, and the contributions of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida and the distinguished junior Senator from Florida, as well as the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada, have been very helpful.

The space shuttle will be the most important rocket vehicle in the U.S. space program and will be available in the late 1970's. This is one thing that the arguments this afternoon failed to take into consideration. It will replace all of the intermediate size launch vehicles and will also launch many of the payloads planned for the giant Saturn 5; and everyone knows that that is a very expensive vehicle. It will be used for science payloads as well as application payloads, and it will also be the only capability for manned space flights after 1974, when the last space flight is scheduled.

Without a shuttle, therefore, there will be no more manned space flights after 1970; and even if the shuttle is developed, as we hope it will be developed, there will be a gap in all manned space flights between 1975 to at least 1977, and perhaps 1978 or 1979.

I would like to speak now about the funding matter, because the funding requested in fiscal year 1971, which is \$110 million, is basically for a conceptual design, and that is all. It does not constitute a commitment to move on to shuttle development, and such a commitment would only be made in terms of the fiscal year 1972 budget, and would have to be approved by the Senate next year when the 1972 budget is under consideration.

The major purpose of these design studies is to fully ascertain the space shuttle cost, and by the time NASA asks for a commitment, probably in 1972, to develop the shuttle, the cost range should be firm. However, we know, even out of the total, the shuttle development cost will be considerably less than stated in the press releases of various Senators.

Now I would like to define exactly what we are talking about here for this space shuttle, and I am going to read from the Extensions of Remarks appearing on

page 21081 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 23, 1970, a letter to Chairman OLIN E. TEAGUE, chairman of the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives. This letter is dated May 28, and is signed by T. O. Paine, Administrator of NASA.

I want to read from it because it will clear up a lot of confusion that many of us really need not have. I skip the first paragraph. I shall place the whole letter in the RECORD, so it will be in the RECORD for all to read. Starting with the second paragraph:

First, I would like to review briefly the NASA policy of phased project planning. Under this policy, major research and development programs are conducted in four sequential phases. The first phase (Phase A) consists primarily of an in-house analysis and preliminary study effort to determine whether the proposed technical approach is feasible. Phase B consists of detailed studies and definition, comparative analyses, and preliminary design directed toward facilitating the choice of a single approach from among the alternate approaches selected through the first phase.

So that phase B which is what we are talking about here, is simply detailed studies and definition, comparative analyses, looking toward the choice of a single approach from among the alternate approaches that might be selected.

Now, at a later point he says:

Accordingly, we selected contractors on May 12 to proceed into the second or definition phase of detailed study, comparative analysis, and preliminary design directed toward facilitating the choice of a single program approach.

He said further:

We will decide at the conclusion of this phase whether it is appropriate to settle on a single design or continue competitive approaches.

So it very clearly shows, from these two or three paragraphs I have read from Mr. Paine's letter, this is not for a design for a model, but, rather, a definition design, or what I have called previously a conceptual design, beyond which they hope to make some selection from alternatives.

Then he goes on in another paragraph and says:

Similarly, these detailed definition studies will permit us to gain a thorough understanding of service life, frequently of utilization, and what is involved when we consider such matters as Air Force requirements. These detailed results will in turn supply the Department of Defense with the information it will need to determine how it will utilize the shuttle and what organizational, logistics, and financial support it should provide.

Then, reading from the penultimate part of the letter I read:

Thus I believe it is clear that the responsible course to be taken is to invest now in the study efforts and proceed at an efficient pace in the future toward bringing into operation a system that will permit us to end the practice of discarding vehicles after a single flight. We will continue this work through the Phase B studies currently being initiated. Then at the conclusion of this phase we will reach another checkpoint at which we will be able to review the situation thoroughly.

I think that should clear up just ex-

actly what we are doing here with the particular amendment that has been offered.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Paine to the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE be included at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., May 28, 1970.
Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Manned Space
Flight, Committee on Science and Astronautics,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your significant and timely inquiries regarding the design, operations, and cost of the space shuttle and related booster system. Attached are specific answers to each of your questions. However, I would like to set forth some general comments on our space planning to establish a framework for the answers to your specific questions.

First, I would like to review briefly the NASA policy of phased project planning. Under this policy, major research and development programs are conducted in four sequential phases. The first phase (Phase A) consists primarily of an in-house analysis and preliminary study effort to determine whether the proposed technical approach is feasible. Phase B consists of detailed studies and definition, comparative analyses, and preliminary design directed toward facilitating the choice of a single approach from among the alternate approaches selected through the first phase. Phase C involves detailed systems design with mockups and test articles to assure the hardware is within the state-of-the-art and that the technical milestone schedules and resource estimates for the next phase are realistic. The final phase (Phase D) covers final hardware design development and project operations.

The phased project planning process provides that the work content of each of the first three phases is directed toward developing information needed to support the decision to proceed into the next phase.

The phased project planning process provides that the work content of each of the first three phases is directed toward developing information needed to support the decision to proceed into the next phase.

NASA and the DOD have been working for more than three years on the preliminary analysis of alternate approaches and concepts, and on the research and technology effort needed to determine whether it is appropriate to develop reusable vehicles that will substantially reduce the cost of operating in space. We have concluded that this is an achievable objective. We are convinced that availability of these vehicles will lead to significant changes in our concepts of operation in the space environment as well as reductions in costs.

Accordingly, we selected contractors on May 12 to proceed into the second or definition phase of detailed study, comparative analysis, and preliminary design directed toward facilitating the choice of a single program approach. These contractor efforts will take place over the next eleven months. However, to assure high flexibility as we proceed, we are continuing with first-phase studies of several alternative approaches.

The steps we are taking now will provide us with more complete information on the very significant questions you and others are asking. We will decide at the conclusion of this phase whether it is appropriate to settle on a single design or continue competitive approaches. We will be able then to take into account technical assessments and opinions

throughout NASA, as well as those of other experts in industry, universities, and other government agencies. We can determine then whether the criteria described in the RFP comprise the most feasible and realistic system, all factors considered.

Similarly, these detailed definition studies will permit us to gain a thorough understanding of service life, frequently of utilization, and what is involved when we consider such matters as Air Force requirements. These detailed results will in turn supply the Department of Defense with the information it will need to determine how it will utilize the shuttle and what organizational, logistics, and financial support it should provide.

One objective of the space shuttle is economy based on broad and flexible utilization of this transportation system. The system will have the capability for a wide variety of future missions including logistic support of manned orbiting systems, delivery of unmanned payloads to orbit, recovery and return or on-orbit repair of satellites, and performance of independent short duration manned missions. We believe that the vehicle design will provide an inherent capability to meet additional applications which will materialize as we acquire experience in this type of space operation. Therefore, the problem of early "dead-ending" should not be experienced in the shuttle program.

This brings us to your third group of questions. Again I wish to emphasize that all of these matters are being pursued vigorously as we enter the definition phase. Alternate approaches are being considered. Formal reviews will be conducted every two or three months. Use of existing hardware and facilities will be fully considered along with the cost and impact of additional facilities, should they be required. Integrated plans were developed in support of the Space Task Group activity during 1969. These plans are being re-examined and updated with consideration of alternatives in the phasing of major program elements consistent with realistic consideration of the budget aspects of the transition from current systems to the space shuttle, space station, and other advanced systems in future years.

Finally, the plan to move toward reusability is based on studies that show the resulting savings will more than repay the cost of development. The economies of reusability will occur in both the vehicle and payload areas. Necessarily, these studies are based in part on assumptions. No one can predict all of the variable factors with certainty for a time period eight to ten years from now. But my associates and I are convinced we are at the very beginning of the utilization of space and space technology for the benefit of men on earth. We believe that these estimates are quite conservative, and that when the shuttle becomes available the traffic to and from earth orbit will increase rapidly. We expect that presently contemplated applications will expand sharply and that others not even foreseen at present will be introduced.

The benefits of the space shuttle are not limited to cost reduction. It is my expectation that this new capability will provide a significant contribution to our national security. It will also provide the capability to do things such as space rescue, which cannot now be done. Furthermore, there is reason to expect that the ability to retrieve, repair, and refurbish objects in space will provide additional improvements in the economy and effectiveness of space operations.

Thus I believe it is clear that the responsible course to be taken is to invest now in the study efforts and proceed at an efficient pace in the future toward bringing into operation a system that will permit us to end the practice of discarding vehicles after a

single flight. We will continue this work through the Phase B studies currently being initiated. Then at the conclusion of this phase we will reach another checkpoint at which we will be able to review the situation thoroughly.

Therefore, in light of all these considerations, we believe that it was a sound decision to move ahead at this time with Phase B of the space shuttle.

Please call on me if I can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

T. O. PAINE,
Administrator.

DESIGN

Question 1—Is it appropriate at this point in time to settle on a single design or concept when the risks and costs of the primary or alternate schemes are not clearly known?

Answer—NASA has not settled on a single design. The Phase B study proposals provide a point of departure for defining a reusable shuttle system. They encompass a range of configurations and design approaches. Technical risks and costs implicit in any of these design alternatives will be prime considerations of the study. Concurrent with Phase B, NASA will continue to study alternate approaches.

Question 2—Have divergencies of opinion within NASA as to basic concepts been taken fully into account?

Answer—Yes, NASA has considered many opinions and taken them into account in evolving the Phase B approach. Extensive in-house evaluation of configurations developed in earlier studies were made prior to release of the RFP. Positions from many sources including the NASA MSF centers and research centers and appropriate Air Force agencies have been melded together to establish the approach taken in our Phase B studies where in these positions will be the subject of continued investigations and definition.

Question 3—Can the RFP be challenged as to its genuine substance, depth, and ultimate acceptance as the most feasible and realistic system, all factors considered?

Answer—The RFP was designed to define baseline requirements and a study plan whereby the contractors will consider alternate approaches and conduct extensive tradeoffs to define a feasible and realistic system.

NASA conducted extensive Design Reference Reviews and configuration studies and these together with the Phase A feasibility studies served as the basis for the RFP. The RFP including the Statement of Work was prepared and reviewed in depth through successive stages by NASA and the Air Force. Consequently, a wide range of expertise was utilized in the preparation and approval of the shuttle RFP.

OPERATIONS

Question 1—Has full consideration been given to Air Force requirements especially to the cross-range capability?

Answer—Yes, Air Force requirements are being given full consideration and especially as regards cross-range.

Under "Study Objectives and Approach" of Phase B Space Shuttle System Statement of Work in-depth study of the cross-range requirement is stipulated as a fundamental objective. The study effort will yield data to evaluate designs of the space shuttle system with the orbiter optimized for a high aerodynamic cross-range of 1500 n.m. and a low aerodynamic cross-range of 200 n.m. NASA will completely evaluate the results of the contractor's two design studies to explore in depth the overall influence of the cross-range performance requirement on the cost, schedule and capability of the space shuttle.

NASA and the Air Force have jointly developed the requirements for a national space transportation system and have devel-

oped a policy of mutual participation in such activities as design review, technology programs, preparation of work statements and Source Evaluation Boards.

Question 2—What is the service life of the shuttle and what is the frequency of utilization?

Answer—Based on previous systems and technology studies, a design goal of one hundred reuses of each vehicle has been established. When the shuttle becomes operational, each flight system will be capable of being readied for another mission within a turn-around time of two weeks. Requirements for these design goals will be evaluated during the Phase D studies.

Question 3—What potential military uses exist for the shuttle and at what point in time and under what circumstances will the Air Force assert its role, specify its missions, and provide organizational logistics and financial support?

Answer—John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering, for DOD stated to the Senate in March of this year that DOD fully supports the Space Shuttle studies in the following testimony.

"Once an economical and operationally effective STS is developed, we would expect to use it to launch essentially all DOD payloads into earth orbit. We hope thereby to reduce DOD launch costs by an order of magnitude. Not only will we economize from the point of view of a reusable launch vehicle, but significant savings can accrue because repair and reuse of payloads will be possible and payloads design criteria would become less stringent. In addition to all of this, we would expect to benefit from the STS technology resulting from NASA's development efforts."

The Air Force and NASA have worked very closely during the past several months to identify their respective missions and associated design requirements. This close working relationship is continuing and the requirements of both agencies are reflected in the Phase B study plan. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of the Air Force have signed an agreement which establishes a Space Transportation Policy Board. It is the function of the Policy Board to assure that the Space Transportation System will fulfill the objectives of both agencies by establishing program objectives including operational aspects, technology status and needs, fiscal considerations and interagency relationship.

COST

Question 1—Have all possible approaches been fully considered to minimize cost and risk?

Answer—Preliminary cost analyses of the space shuttle system have been underway for a number of months, but a more comprehensive study must await the time when the data from the Phase B definition studies is available. Under the Phase B studies, cost, performance, and schedule and their associated technical risk will be prime tradeoff factors in all design decisions. This is consistent with the stated program objective: to provide a low-cost, economical space transportation system based on both minimized development and operational costs.

Question 2—What bench marks can be established in the program to assure that the lowest risk design has been chosen and is being developed at optimum cost?

Answer—During the period of performance of Phase B studies for the engines and systems, large scale formal reviews at the end of the third, sixth, eighth and eleventh months will be conducted by NASA to insure that the studies are proceeding in the desired manner. NASA will conduct in-house analyses of the contractors' efforts and will perform an in-depth examination of the Phase B results and a continuing appraisal of potential alternate approaches. In addition, design certification and operational program

experience such as that gained in Apollo will enable NASA to insure that the proper system consistent with optimum cost, performance and low risk is carried forward for detailed design and development in later phases.

Question 3—Is existing hardware and facilities directly applicable and usable for the new shuttle being utilized to the maximum extent?

Answer—Several study activities are being initiated which will provide insight as to the capabilities of existing facilities to support the shuttle and to define possible additional facility requirements. The Phase B studies will identify major facility requirements for the shuttle. An independent assessment of all facility requirements will also be made.

Consideration is being given to the possible use of existing facilities for engine evaluations, wind tunnel tests, structural investigations, vacuum chamber simulations and operational planning. Also included is the consideration of existing launch and support facilities at KSC and WTR and the flight test facilities of NASA and the Air Force. At this time, only a limited effort has been initiated on the space shuttle that would require the use of facilities. Since the shuttle configurations are in an evolutionary state at this time it is not possible to make a final commitment on facility requirements.

Question 4—Has NASA prepared integrated plans for various systems with realistic consideration given to reasonable budget aspects during the period?

Answer—Yes. Integrated plans were developed in support of the Space Task Group activity during 1969. During the past year NASA has conducted continuous planning activities to further develop these integrated plans. Several alternative levels of funding were included in the Space Task Group studies. These integrated plans are being reassessed and updated with consideration of alternatives in the phasing of major program elements and development efforts to conform to realistic expectations with respect to annual budget levels.

Question 5—Has consideration been given fully to the cost and impact of additional facilities in new programs and proposals?

Answer—Consideration is being given to the cost and impact of additional facilities should any be necessary.

Space Shuttle facilities requirements will be examined during the Phase B system studies. In addition, NASA has established a Facilities Task Group whose function will be to prepare an overall Space Shuttle facilities plan. This plan will reflect recommendations as to the facilities necessary to support activities identified by the Phase B contractors and by NASA and DOD. Each proposed facility requirement will be evaluated against several factors including the possible utilization of existing facilities. New facilities requirements will be identified where the use of existing resources is not justified. Economic analysis and cost tradeoffs will be carefully weighed in each case.

Mr. ALLOTT. In substance, Mr. President, the remarks during the debate on this matter today have been exactly the same as the debate we heard when we had the authorization bill before the Senate. At that time there was offered an amendment to reduce the authorization and to take the space shuttle out of the authorization.

Mr. President, I wish to express, and express very strongly, that this is not a hardening of design. It is anything but that. It shows a very cautious, intelligent, and planned approach to the whole matter.

Another matter of which we have

heard again this time is the "monkey argument." We heard the "monkey argument" during the course of the authorization at some length.

It was widely reported in the press that the Soviet cosmonauts suffered serious ill effects from their recent record-breaking flight. These reports have been used by some as a justification to reduce appropriations for our space program.

This argument, Mr. President, has been used again today, the argument being, of course, that because a monkey could not stand 8 days in space, the spacemen could not. We have orbited men 14 days, and the Soviets have orbited them almost 18 days; and while I am prone to say that there is a great deal of difference between a man and a monkey, there might be some who would argue with me.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator recall that a year or two ago, the Russians began their talk of launching a platform, and that a little after that, they had three satellites up at one time, to show that they could join them and enable transfers back and forth between them, and to show that there is an ability for joining between a spacecraft setup and a platform, if it were there in orbit?

Mr. ALLOTT. I recall that very well, yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. And yet we apparently pay no attention at all to the fact that, from those facts and from the discussions in those months, many months ago, it was quite clear that the Russians were moving toward exactly what we are moving toward, and they showed it even more clearly by this 17-day plus venture in space the other day, attempting to discover what was the biomedical situation.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is entirely correct. I do not know how one could very well interpret those two aspects of the Russian activities in any other way.

I think there are two false assumptions in the argument for the amendment. The first, of course, is that we are talking here about sending men into far-out planetary exploration. There is no such purpose in this space shuttle whatever. It is not intended for that. It is intended for the more economical and expeditious use of our money, for which the very people have been arguing who now offer this amendment.

The second false assumption, I think, is that somehow or other we are planning to keep people in orbit all of their lives, send them up and leave them up there. I do not think anyone has that in mind. I know there is a limitation. I do not know exactly what those limitations are now.

But the amendment, it seems to me, is based upon those two false assumptions. The space shuttle is important, because then men may go up to orbiting laboratories and back without the very great expense which is attendant upon the use of our very heavy boosters, or even our intermediate boosters.

In a recent press conference with respect to the introduction of amendments cutting the NASA budget, it was stated

that the reports on the Soviet Soyuz 9 flight were a major factor behind the decision to seek a substantial reduction in space funds.

We now know, Mr. President, that these reports were inaccurate.

A report by the Library of Congress concludes that the Soviets consider the flight a success. The chief designer of the Soyuz spacecraft stated that as a result of the flight:

It is possible to conclude that man can stay and work in space for at least two or three months.

Let me quote further from the Library of Congress Report:

On 23 June TASS issued a statement concerning the health of the cosmonauts which was subject to some unfortunate interpretation. The actual TASS statement reads as follows: "The general condition of the cardiovascular system [of the cosmonauts] is normal, although a certain instability is observed, and this indicates that the process of readaptation of the organism from weightlessness to terrestrial condition has not yet been completed. It is quite possible that it will be expedient to create artificial gravity on spacecraft or orbital stations. In a word, the adaptation of man to conventional conditions [of gravity] after a long journey in space is not so simple after all."

The above statement was interpreted to mean that the cosmonauts were in serious cardiovascular trouble and that it was doubtful whether man could stand spaceflight without artificial gravity. These reports were widely circulated in the press and on the radio in the United States on June 24th. It should be noted that on the 24th TASS issued another statement of a more optimistic nature and retracted the implication that artificial gravity would be necessary. The TASS statement of 24 June indicated that man could stand weightlessness for up to one month.

Since the basic purpose of the flight was biomedical, it is obvious the Soviets would give close attention to the cosmonauts' condition.

It is unfortunate, however, that inaccurate information would be used as justification to curtail our own efforts in space, even though I know that the information was given in good faith.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. It has been said here several times today that these arguments have been made time and time again. My own position, of course, is not on the question of the desirability of the program; it is on the question of where we are going to place our priorities. The only thing I wish to say at this time is this: If it is inflationary, let us say, to provide funds for impacted areas, to keep our children in school and give them the proper kind of an education, the Senator from Rhode Island does not understand the necessity for this program and the pursuance of it at this particular time.

That is the only argument I make. There may be some distant military value to it. I do not dispute that. There might be some scientific value to it. All these programs are very desirable.

But for now, I feel inherently and innately that we have reached the time where we have to properly allocate the

money available to us, and I think this is one of the things that can wait.

My reason for rising was that I have been told that there is a possibility of limiting debate on this amendment so that we could come to a vote. I ask the Senator from Colorado whether an hour and a half, with 45 minutes on each side, would do.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I would like to say to the distinguished Senator that as far as I am concerned—and, of course, I am doing this at the chairman's request—if I may finish up in 10 minutes at the very maximum, which I think I can, the distinguished junior Senator from Florida has approximately 20 minutes, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) have requested time—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) wants 30 minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Let us make it 45 minutes on a side.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1½ hours, 45 minutes to the side.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that the time in opposition to the amendment be controlled by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PASTORE. By the Senator from Colorado, and the time of the proponents in behalf of the amendment will be controlled by the Senator from Minnesota, that is correct. The Senator from Rhode Island will be neutral.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield myself such time as I shall use.

Mr. President, it has been suggested that NASA should undertake more programs in cooperation with other nations. I believe the record is clear that NASA has pursued international cooperation in a most aggressive manner. This occurred not only under the present Administrator, Mr. Paine, who, incidentally, was an appointee of the previous administration, but also under Mr. James Webb, who was the former Administrator. There have been cooperative flight projects with other nations; there are such projects as the Helios project with West Germany underway today. I call the attention of my colleagues to part 3 of the hearings of the Senate Space Committee on the fiscal year 1971 NASA authorization which is devoted in its entirety to international space cooperation.

But most important to the space shuttle issue before the Senate today is the fact that NASA has invited participation of the European Space Community in the space shuttle and space station program. Dr. Paine, the Administrator of NASA, met with members of the European Space Community in Paris from June 3 to June 5 to outline the U.S. space station program and invite these

nations to evaluate their strength and interests and thereby assess the participation they desire to have in the program.

A similar session is scheduled on the space shuttle program in Bonn, Germany, on July 7 and 8. The NASA team will be headed by Dr. Homer Newell, Associate Administrator of NASA. It is understood that the Europeans are greatly interested in assuming responsibility for selected modules or systems in the space shuttle program.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield, on the time of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. Have the European countries promised to contribute to this joint project?

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not have that information. It is too early to know. The first meetings were held in June. Another is scheduled on July 7 and 8.

Mr. MONDALE. Is it the impression of the Senator from Colorado that they will contribute substantial amounts of money to this joint project?

Mr. ALLOTT. As I read the report, I do not know that it is based upon that assumption, but, rather, that they would develop and finance certain modules or certain parts of the spacecraft in Europe.

The point is that it is not true that there have not been any efforts made to bring the European community in and they are just now getting in.

Mr. MONDALE. My only point is that I very much suspect that this is going to be the type of space cooperation we have seen before—where the other countries stand back and cooperate and we spend all the money. I was wondering whether this is likely to be the same kind of cooperation.

Mr. ALLOTT. I would not make any projections on that, because, so long as they can get us to spend our money, they will do it, and the Senator knows that.

However, for the Senator's information, just as great efforts have been made to get the cooperation of the Russians in a joint space program; and they obviously feel—contrary to what some people on the floor of the Senate feel—that there is a very close military application of this entire program, and they do not get very far with the rest of it.

Here are very active and current efforts on the part of NASA to engage international participation in these forward looking developments. This participation has been recommended on several occasions by those who would cut the NASA appropriation on the basis that our funds could be saved through joint funding. Yet today just when NASA is actively seeking this participation and cooperation, amendments are being proposed to prohibit further study of the space shuttle program in this country or to reduce NASA funding to such a level that it would be virtually impossible to fund such efforts. Mr. President, this is completely inconsistent. It is also, and probably most important, a damaging blow to international cooperation and certainly strains the credibility of the

United States as to the seriousness of its overtures to seek a greater degree of international cooperation.

Mr. President, I have heard the argument this afternoon that if this is a military vehicle, it should be over in military. Yet, the same people who so argue have been arguing for years that all these projects should be in one agency of the Government. They are now in one agency of the Government, and this is the way I think we will make the greatest progress.

In conclusion, I should just like to voice one thought: The Senator from Colorado was one of those who called and asked for some very hard studies at the time of the announcement by President Kennedy that we should send a man to the moon in the decade of the 1960's. I do not think that that was given the thought by our scientists that it should have been given, but we have done it. But the fallout of the space program—about which I will talk later—has been so fantastic in almost every field—the electronics field, the metallurgical field, the physics field, even the nuclear physics field, the field of astrophysics, and the medical field—that it is almost impossible for a single individual to understand it. But I will say this. I have watched these appropriations for research for many, many years, and no research program in the United States has provided the dynamic forward thrust and accomplishment that the space program has provided, because without it many of the things that are commonplace today—even including our computers—would not be here if there had not been the necessity for their development. Are we going to stop now and quit our space program? I hope not.

We are not talking about sending a man to Mars. We are not talking about sending a man to Venus. We are talking about orbital laboratories around the earth which will enable us to study, even to a greater extent, for example, spots on the sun, and all the things that can be studied outside the atmosphere of the earth, without the interference of the atmosphere of the earth.

So as we go into the next space age, do we want to leave the 5 years between 1974 and 1979 vacant while the Russians are developing this technology, or do we want to proceed at this point to try to define under phase B, as I read a few moments ago, the initial stages, so that at least a choice can be made of one or two directions in which the United States may go?

We are at the stage now that we were back in 1960, perhaps, when we were talking about the various forms of structures that might be used to get a man on the moon and retrieve a man from the moon. Now we are talking about the same thing. The big boosters that we have now are the horse and buggies of the future space age. They are expensive, they will continue to be expensive, and they will place a great financial burden upon the resources of this or any other country. There is one way in which that can be cut down, and that is by starting to define now the conceptual design of a space shuttle which, in fact, will take us

into the second great era of our space program for which we have had so many benefits in every scientific area of the world.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I oppose this amendment to cut out the money for the space shuttle for this appropriation bill.

Essentially, what we have here is a replay of the authorization bill some months ago, earlier in the year. The same amendment was offered then, the same arguments were made, and the Senate rejected that, as the distinguished Senator from Florida pointed out, by a margin of almost 2 to 1; and I hope the Senate will reject the amendment again today by a similar margin.

The principal facts for the space shuttle program and also against the proponents of the amendment have been set out ably and in full by the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, as well as my own colleague from Florida, Mr. HOLLAND.

I should like to make some general remarks which will apply not only to the pending amendment but also to some others which are intended to be offered later, to cut out money from the bill.

Mr. President, the committee recommendation for a NASA appropriation of \$3,319,303,000 is the absolute minimum amount necessary to retain the technical team and facilities we must have for an admittedly low key, but viable space program in the next decade.

A reduction of any magnitude will not merely result in further deferrals and delays. It will mean the termination of programs in which we have invested substantial amounts of money, which took years to build. It will mean a reversal of the President's Space Task Force directive for stable, long-range goals in space. If we cut back this amount we will be saying, in effect, that it is no longer a goal of this Nation to maintain its world leadership in technological achievement. We should not do this. We must not do this.

The President's Space Task Group was assigned the job of charting a new course in space for the next decade, one which would be consistent with austere budget goals. The reexamination of future directives in space, which is now being called for by the proponents of further cuts, was precisely the job of the Space Task Group. They developed three near- and long-term options based on the current economic climate, and technological capabilities of NASA.

NASA then recommended a budget level to implement the Space Task Group directives—a solid approach to space exploration without the waste pitfalls of a crash program. The NASA request to the Bureau of the Budget, based on the Space Task Group recommendation was \$4.497 billion. The administration, in view of rising inflation, urgent domestic needs, and competing demands, felt it necessary to further reduce this figure to \$3.333 billion. This amounted to a cut of over a billion dollars.

There has been a lot of argument made as to priorities. It seems to me that so far as priorities are concerned, the space program for the past 3 years has been placed in a low priority. If we place it any lower, we will place it out of business.

I point this out to show that NASA has already taken one of the biggest cuts proportionally, of any of the agencies so far this year. Compared to previous years, it is down by billions of dollars. The budget estimate is \$2.5 billion below our 1966 space program. This means that it has been cut by 40 percent—close to half. Comparing it with expenditures in other fields over the last decade—while defense spending has gone up by 73 percent, domestic social programs spending has increased 222 percent—the space program has declined by 40 percent overall—down to almost half of its budget 4 years ago. To accommodate this lower funding, NASA made very substantial reductions in its program. Decisions were made to:

Reduce electronic research and close the Electronics Research Center in Boston, Mass.

Suspend the production of the Saturn V launch vehicle following vehicle No. 15.

Defer the launch of Skylab I, America's first experimental space station, by 4 months to late 1972.

Delay the Apollo 18 and 19 lunar landing missions from 1972 to 1974.

Delay the unmanned Viking Mars landing flight from 1973 to 1975.

Delay two advanced technology satellite missions incorporating direct broadcasting and other experiments, by 1 year, from 1972 and 1974 to 1973 and 1975.

Terminate the NASA sustaining university program.

The committee is to be commended for its recommendations to keep the appropriation amount in the research and development and construction of facility areas, on the level of the budget estimate. I was encouraged by the fact that the Appropriation Committee restored the \$106 million in research and development taken out by the House appropriation.

The amount recommended for research and development however, is still \$87 million under the authorization and almost \$500 million under the 1970 appropriation. A further reduction by the Senate in this already austere budget of any amount whatever will not mean that NASA will have to just tighten its belt—it will mean crippling key programs and the loss of irreplaceable personnel.

In my judgment, NASA simply cannot take further reductions. When the House cut \$106 million in research and development, it was done with the idea that the reduction could be accommodated by reducing the number of lunar landing missions during fiscal year 1971 from two to one.

The Deputy Administrator of NASA, Dr. George M. Low, has stated that this assumption is not borne out by the facts. Dr. Low said on May 11, 1970, that the maximum fiscal year 1971 cost reductions resulting from such a deferral are estimated to be from \$10 to \$20 million. Moreover, the House NASA oversight study recently reported that:

A launch rate of less than two manned

vehicles per year would materially increase the risk of mission failure in space flight.

According to Dr. Low, the \$106 million, to say nothing of a larger cut, would require NASA to examine all of its research and development programs with a view toward further delays and terminations.

It is inconceivable to me that we could even consider a course of action which surely means slowly abandoning the continued leadership in space we enjoy today. Reducing this budget by \$110 million—to say nothing of the 20 percent cut—\$600 million—advocated by my colleagues, will mean just that.

The question has been raised as to whether to delete the research funds for a space shuttle. This has been suggested by some of my distinguished colleagues, and would constitute a crucial turning point for the U.S. space program. I suggest that it would constitute a decision to end our manned space flight capability after 1974. Based on our presented manned space flight program, we face a gap from 1975 to 1977. If the shuttle money is taken out of this budget now, the gap will be stretched to 3 and to possibly 5 years.

The space station/shuttle money is for research and design only. It is not even hardware money. It does not commit us to a Mars mission or to great future expenditures. Its whole purpose is just the opposite—to reduce costs through a reusable shuttle which can return men, cargo, and equipment back to earth, thereby producing economies in every aspect of space operations. It is being designed to enable us to continue a viable space exploration program at perhaps half the amount it has cost in the past to put payloads into earth orbit. It will also be available on short notice for Department of Defense use should that need ever arise.

Mr. President, we know the concept of a shuttle station has been studied in many countries in the last decade. Now that the technology is available, we cannot afford to throw away this opportunity to take the initiative and carry out an orderly program.

Dr. Paire, NASA Administrator, in testimony before the Senate space committee recently said:

Space astronomy has come into being at an exciting time when astronomers are wrestling with some of the most puzzling problems ever turned up in man's investigation of the universe. Huge radio galaxies, quasars, pulsars, and numerous X-ray sources are still unexplained. Some of these objects emit energies at unbelievable and prodigious rates, suggesting that we may be witnessing new, powerful modes of energy production, different from those we have known in the past. Recalling that our present day knowledge of nuclear energy stemmed from inquiries into how the sun produced its radiant energy, we can speculate that today's space astronomy may eventually also yield results of tremendous technical importance. Satellites provide the means for making observations in the radio, infrared, ultra violet, X-ray, and gamma-ray-wave-lengths that cannot penetrate the earth's atmosphere to the ground so space astronomy is giving astronomers powerful new tools for investigating these challenging new questions.

I can candidly admit that many of us, as laymen, do not understand quasars

and pulsars and the like—I cannot adequately explain them or their theoretical basis. But, on expert testimony, we know they are important and have implications which are far reaching. It is not difficult to speculate that the experimental conditions offered by a space station has the potential of leading to discoveries equal in magnitude to the breakthrough in our knowledge of atomic energy.

The leadtime for carrying out the development and putting into operation a space shuttle program is 7 to 10 years.

There is no question in my mind that the Soviet Union is pushing hard right now to put a manned earth-resources satellite into orbit in the next few years. They devote a good deal more of their national budget to space than we do. We cannot risk being confronted, once again, with a major Russian victory which may give its developer effective control of space.

When the Sputnik went up years ago, I remind my colleagues, it was the greatest propaganda defeat, in the eyes of the world, that this Nation ever suffered. It took us a decade to regain our position. A stop-start operation, which is what we are proposing by these further cuts in NASA's budget, necessarily involves the risk that at some future time we will have to produce another crash program, at a much greater expense.

I cannot emphasize strongly enough that any amount of reduction in this already austere budget will have serious consequences on our future space capabilities. As a result of the precipitous decline in funds since 1966, we are already witnessing the dismantling of the superb aerospace industry—the Government-academic team which it has taken years to build and which would take years to build again. We are closing some of our finest laboratories and contractor-operated facilities and others are rapidly phasing down. While these slowdowns are causing serious economic problems in the area affected, even more important is the consideration of the longrun loss to the Nation.

As I have said in the past, I think that it is our duty and responsibility in Congress to reorder our national priorities. We are on that road and it is good that we are. We have very often paid too much attention to the nostrums and catchwords of the past, while at the same time neglecting clear, pressing, and immediate needs that have arisen in the intervening years. The point I would make here is that NASA is not reactionary or backward looking. NASA is the wave of the future and we have it in our power to make our already substantial investment pay off in great dividends, not only for our own country but for humanity as a whole.

We all know many of the hard and tangible benefits that have sprung from the space program. The 50,000 gulf coast residents know that without NASA and its weather satellite detection and tracking, they might have lost their lives during Hurricane Camille.

We know the potential space photography has for monitoring water resources, agricultural activity, and assist-

ing in our fight against pollution and our search for new resources.

We have begun to understand through our study of atmospheric dynamics the tremendous changes on earth has caused in the earth's fragile atmosphere. We can now measure these changes and potentially this understanding can be a powerful tool in environment control and in preserving a livable planet.

The global communications satellite network, that is a direct product of our space effort, is akin to a nervous system of humankind and civilized society—linking the nations of the world and filling a vital need.

The catalog of benefits directly attributable to our space progress is long. It is still growing. The potential for future spin-offs, byproducts, advances and benefits really cannot be estimated.

I think we could devote hours to recounting the dividends in any one of these fields: In medicine, in transportation or communications, in weather predictions, in computer technology, in oceanography; pollution control, the management of our environment, in education, in pure science.

If we call a halt to space exploration now, we have no idea what benefits we may be overlooking or bypassing, postponing or neglecting.

Let us not do that: Let us go on and continue to build on the base we have so laboriously and systematically—and yes, expensively—developed.

Quite apart from the direct and obvious byproducts of our space progress, we should not forget that the program has made a major contribution to our economy. It is a productive program and the investment we have made has multiplied and benefited the whole national economy. It has, over the last decade, cost us, in dollar investments, less than one-half of 1 percent of our gross national product but that investment has directly resulted in increasing the gross national product.

Economists estimate that approximately 50 percent of the real growth in the gross national product in the last decade can be attributed to the stimulus of new technological knowledge from research and development investments. Twenty-five percent of the Nation's total expenditures on research and development was carried out under our space program.

In the past, scientific and technological development has resulted, more often than not, from wartime competition—and at a horrible price. I suggest that in our time we have made a major effort to reverse that grisly picture. As President Eisenhower said at the beginning of the space age, space offers an opportunity for peaceful and hopefully friendly competition between the United States and the Soviet Union. The space race has stimulated advances in pure and applied science and related fields between our two countries which has benefited both, without the terror or misery of war. We have no way of precisely measuring the effect of this competition on the relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. but I think we must recognize that in general

terms, the competition has been good and it has helped promote the thaw we all want to see.

All of our intelligence indicates that the Soviets are pushing hard to develop a space station and to regain their lost advantage. As a matter of fact, of course, the most recent Soviet flight that went for 18 days must be directly in the thrust of the effort that the space station and the sky lab we are going to develop, and the space shuttle that is going to serve, it is going to. And certainly this is not the time for us to ponder and to cut out a program that the Soviets are pushing ahead on with full speed.

The Soviets know, perhaps better than we, the impact our spectacular successes in space have had on world opinion—and how their prestige as a leader in science and technology suffered thereby. We have the advantage—the momentum and opportunity now. It would be cruel and thoughtless and irresponsible to dissipate that lead at this time—not because we are unable to maintain it, but because we are unwilling to spend the comparatively small amount of money necessary to carry to a logical fruition that which has already been begun. In the long run, in my view, such a course will operate to our national disadvantage. In the long run, it will be false economy. It is shortsighted in the extreme. To fritter away our space program now is unrealistic and unwise, in my judgment. The budget before us is an austere and reasonable one that will allow us to realize a profit on the past investment.

I would certainly urge my colleagues to resist further cuts, the cut now pending before us in the matter of the space shuttle as well as others that may come after the pending amendment is dealt with.

The cuts in the already austere budget would bring us perilously close to crippling this fine and valuable program for all time.

In summary, I suppose one could really put it in this fashion, that if the pending amendment is agreed to and the space shuttle is cut out of the budget, we might just as well wipe out manned space flight in the years ahead. We would have lost our advantage whereas our competition, of course, will go on with full speed ahead in this very effort.

If the day comes when we cannot match our competition in manned space flight and we take a back seat and second place in this all important research and development, engineering and scientific and technological venture, then I would say that this Nation would take second place in a lot of other areas, too.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to reject the pending amendment and any other effort to cut the budget which is already dangerously austere.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has 18 minutes remaining. The Senator from Minnesota has 43 minutes remaining.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. DOLE). The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, during my tenure as a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences I have frequently questioned the cost of the Apollo program along with all other space expenditures. My questions have reflected the views of the public with whom I have had contact—their excitement and pride in the Nation's space achievements, but also the large expenditures necessitated by our commitment to the space program.

The question of expenditures is a very real one, and therefore, I was greatly impressed by the NASA presentation on technology transfer before the committee earlier this year. This data on benefits from the space program accruing to all mankind to help solve some of the problems on earth has been printed under the title space program benefits. I commend this document to my colleagues for their study.

Mr. President, I might add that I am having copies of this particular document sent to all libraries in my State of Oregon in order that there may be a broader public understanding of such benefits that accrue to us from space research.

Also during the committee review of the Apollo 13 mission, I asked Astronaut Lovell for his opinion on benefits accruing from the space program. He stated that in his travels throughout the United States he has found the stimulus to young people to pursue an education as one of the specific benefits resulting from the space program. This, I believe, is particularly important to a country that has a responsibility for world leadership.

It is on the basis of these more tangible factors that I urge my colleagues to support the NASA appropriation as reported to the Senate by the Subcommittee on Independent Offices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. DOLE). The Senator from Colorado has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Minnesota has proposed an amendment to cut \$110 million from NASA's budget for the space shuttle-space station.

From his statement, I understand that the Senator's main objection is that this money represents the start of a new phase in our Nation's efforts in space, and that this authorization will bind us to a \$14 billion commitment. Unfortunately, the Senator relied too heavily on information from outside sources and much of it is erroneous.

It is important to realize that the money for the space shuttle-space station is only to study these concepts. NASA stated before the appropriate congressional committees that this money was necessary to determine whether a shuttle was technically and economically

feasible. Before the Space Committee, in response to close questioning by the senior Senator from Maine, NASA witnesses stated that NASA does not have approval to proceed with the development of either a space station or shuttle.

The Senator from Minnesota states that there should be studies to compare the operation of a shuttle with existing expendable boosters, and that the technical problems that still exist should be resolved before development of a shuttle is initiated, yet his amendment is designed to eliminate the means to fund the study he suggests and to resolve the problems he cites. He would delete the money that is needed to follow his suggestions.

But aside from that, what would the Senator's amendment do?

For a long time now, people have been asking for a greater return on our investment in space, and we have pointed with pride to our weather and communications satellites. Now we are on the verge of developing a totally new system that can place into orbit and return to earth men, spacecraft, experiments, and so forth, at considerably less cost than existing launch vehicles. The space station will be there expressly to develop earth applications.

This shuttle/station will give us the ability to operate in space; to repair the communications or scientific satellite that falls; to examine interesting events in space; to deliver and return film from the earth resources satellites; to manufacture in the space environment; to learn the effect of space on healing; to study the stars.

Let me say, Mr. President, that we hear a lot from those not too well informed about manned and unmanned spacecraft on the promise that unmanned spacecraft are cheaper than manned spacecraft. That artificial division is about to disappear. The space shuttle will be used to put automated spacecraft as well as all men into earth orbit because the shuttle gives every promise of being a cheaper way to get the automated spacecraft into orbit. Since it will be able to do the job cheaper, it is envisioned that all the NASA and Air Force boosters between the Scout and the Saturn V would disappear and their jobs taken over by the shuttle.

It is as foolish to retreat from the next era in space as it would have been to have built the railroad track across the continent and then not have funded the locomotives to take advantage of that track, or to have backed away from the jet aircraft for commercial use when we were doing all right with slower, less productive propeller aircraft.

Mr. President, we are in the space age. As John Kennedy said:

Man, in his quest for knowledge and progress is determined and cannot be deterred. The exploration of space will go ahead, whether we join it or not, and it is one of the great adventures of all time, and no nation which expects to be the leader of other nations can expect to stay behind in this race for space.

If we are to maintain our place in the world, Mr. President, we must study with care the next major step, so as to understand clearly where the future in space

lies. This money for the space shuttle-space station will make that study.

I urge the defeat of the amendment.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) for a conference report, the time to be taken out of neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1519) to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Services, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 24, 1970, pp. 21284-21286, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the conferees appointed by the Senate and the House met in committee of conference on S. 1519, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Act and have resolved all differences between the two versions of the bill. Of the 10 differences to be resolved, three were of major importance. The other seven differences did not indicate a real difference of position between the two Houses and their resolution created no problem. Therefore, in reporting on the conference, I will confine my remarks to the three major differences.

The Senate bill established the Commission on Libraries and Information Science within the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, while the House amendment established the Commission as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government. The Senate recedes.

The Senate bill authorized the Commission to accept contributions of money and to disburse such contributions for the purposes of the Commission, while the House amendment did not. The House recedes.

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment authorized an appropriation of \$500,000 for fiscal year 1970. The Senate limited the appropriation in the following fiscal years to \$750,000 each year. The House amendment placed no ceiling on appropriations for fiscal years after fiscal year 1970. The conference report adopts this provision of the Senate bill.

As chairman of the conferees on the part of the Senate, I am satisfied that the

bill is the best which could have been brought out of conference. All members of the committee of conference signed the report. I recommend its adoption. I move that the Senate adopt the report of the committee of conference on S. 1519.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, before us is the conference report on S. 1519, a bill I introduced for the purpose of creating a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

I urge upon the Senate the approval of the report. It will bring to fruition a recommendation that originated in 1966 with President Johnson, when he established by Executive order a National Advisory Commission on Libraries. Its mission was to study the role of libraries in education, and how they should be financed. The Commission report called for a continuous surveillance of library contributions and needs by a permanent Commission.

The bill carries out that recommendation.

Among the findings of financial need which the Presidential Commission reported was a lump sum of \$1.6 billion to stock all school libraries optimally. Construction costs of public school libraries were estimated at \$2.145 billion, and for general public libraries at \$1.132 billion over a span of a decade.

Academic library costs are also large: \$360 million is needed for construction and nearly \$10 billion for books and materials over a 10-year period.

Clearly, the task of analyzing needs, focusing attention, and organizing efforts to support libraries is a long-term one. A sustained effort, unflagging enthusiasm, and professional background in the library field are needed to carry it out.

As provided in the conference report, the Commission will study library and informational needs and the means by which those needs may be met. It will advise Federal, State, local, and private agencies on library matters and develop plans for meeting national and local needs.

The Commission will submit reports to the President and to Congress.

The major difference between the House and Senate was over its administrative status. The Senate bill put the Commission into the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the House bill made it independent. I made the motion in conference that the Senate recede and accept the House view that it be independent.

Mr. President, books are not just for boys and girls. They are for students of every age and every walk of life and in every profession and occupation. President Kennedy reminded us that the doors to the library lead to the richest treasures of our open society: to the power of knowledge; to training and skills; to the wisdom, ideals, and culture which enrich life.

S. 1519 will help open those doors to every American.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17548) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, my able colleague from the State of Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), is necessarily absent today, but he has prepared a statement that he asked me to insert in the RECORD. As the immediate past chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for Independent Offices, and as a member of the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee, Senator MAGNUSON's views are worthy of the Senate's attention.

Senator MAGNUSON is opposed to a reduction in the budget of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—NASA—and if he were here today he would vote to keep the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee intact.

I would like to call the attention of the Senate particularly to Senator MAGNUSON's statement that—

The space station is the next logical step in outer space and the space shuttle is the only logical step in cutting space costs. These programs may never be completed, if the research and development prove them to be unwarranted. But we can and we must give the space station/space shuttle concept a chance. It holds the promise, not only of cutting the cost of space exploration, but of dramatically increasing our knowledge of our planet, our solar system, and our universe. We cannot and we must not ignore the opportunity to obtain that knowledge.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MAGNUSON's statement be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement by Senator MAGNUSON was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the remarks I have to make today are virtually the same as those I made when the Senate considered these same issues on May 6. At that time, we were debating an amendment to the authorization bill for NASA; today we are debating amendments to NASA's appropriation for the coming fiscal year.

The amendments today are of two basic types: first, an amendment to limit funds for the space station/space shuttle program, and second, amendments to reduce NASA's funds in general. While I fully agree with the sponsors of these amendments that economy in space is needed, and while I subscribe to the view that our Federal spending priorities must be reordered, I believe that the Senate should reject each of these amendments.

Mr. President, the terrifying adventure of Apollo 13 forced us to think about outer space and man's place in it with an intensity reminiscent of the launch of Sputnik, the first manned flight, or the first landing on the lunar surface. The Apollo 13 mission also emphasized how oriented we are in our thinking to particular missions, particular successes and crises, and how little public discussion we have devoted to the long-term questions of our space program and its purposes. That the space program has a future beyond the moon—and that man will benefit

from that future—has largely been obscured or forgotten.

The pending amendments provide us with an opportunity and a responsibility to consider man's future in outer space. For many years we have heard cries for economy in outer space, cries that have been answered by a continual reduction in the budget of NASA, and cries that have been answered in the reduction in number of planned space missions. As the immediate past chairman of the appropriations subcommittee responsible for NASA's budget, I know that these calls for economy have also been answered by intense scrutiny of NASA's programs.

The current controversy over the space station/space shuttle programs, for example, comes at a time when many millions of Americans are questioning our role in space, the cost of that role, and the importance of that role relative to other pressing domestic needs. Unfortunately, too, the controversy arises during the aftermath of the Apollo 13 mission—a major failure that has added immensely to the number of critics of the space program. It would be tragic, however, if the Apollo 13 mission were used by critics of the space program to transform reasonable calls for economy into unreasonable demands for a fundamental retrenchment in outer space.

I think it is healthy and important to consider and to discuss fully the issues of priorities and of man's role in outer space. But I think it would be most harmful to the quality of that discussion to permit ourselves to be swayed by the emotion that the Apollo 13 mission has created. The space station/space shuttle issue—and in fact the whole NASA appropriation—can and should be looked at in the light of hard facts, not emotion, and I would like to present some of those facts today in connection with the pending amendments.

First, we must realize that the funds we appropriate this year for the space station/space shuttle project do not constitute a commitment to a multi-billion dollar new program. Rather, they are simply funds for advanced research and development of the space station/space shuttle concept—research and development that must be undertaken before we can make an intelligent and rational decision on whether to go ahead with production of these vehicles and outer space facilities. We are not, with these funds, abdicating responsibility for that production decision—indeed, we cannot avoid having to make that decision in future years. Congressional control over spending lies in continual review, annual decisions, and the retention of control over ultimate production decisions. Such control does not lie in giving a "green light" to such an expensive program, once and for all, at such an early stage in the program's development.

The funds we provide this year should bring the space station/space shuttle program to the point where we can make an intelligent decision in the future. By providing these funds, let me emphasize again, we are *not* making a final production decision. By *not* providing these funds, however, we would be making a premature decision *not* to go ahead with this program. Let us permit the research and development to continue until we reach that production decision point; let us not cancel this program in our haste to come to a premature decision about the program's merits.

Second, to cancel the space station/space shuttle program at this point would not be economical—rather, it would be false economy in the purest sense of the phrase. The program—particularly the space shuttle aspect—is an economy effort, an effort to lower the cost of space exploration by developing reusable space vehicles. Today it costs us almost \$1000 per pound for every object we loft into space; tomorrow, with the aid of the

reusable space shuttle, we may cut these costs by 90%. In other words, for the same dollar expenditure the space shuttle will allow us to put almost ten times as many missions into space; the scientific benefits of more missions, explorations, and manned flights will be achieved with dramatically lower costs. Imagine how much more we would know about the moon and the origins of our own planet, for example, if for the price of our past four Apollo missions we could have provided dozens or even scores of such missions.

I would emphasize additionally that the Senate has already taken a major economy step by reducing the House authorization for these programs by nearly \$140 million. The \$110 million remaining for the space station/space shuttle is, in the judgment of both the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee and the Appropriations Committee, a sufficient amount to proceed with the research and development of this program.

The space station is the next logical step in outer space and the space shuttle is the only logical step in cutting space costs. These programs may never be completed, if the research and development prove them to be unwarranted. But we can and we must give the space station/space shuttle concept a chance. It holds the promise, not only of cutting the cost of space exploration, but of dramatically increasing our knowledge of our planet, our solar system, and our universe. We cannot and we must not ignore the opportunity to obtain that knowledge.

With respect to those amendments seeking to cut NASA's funds, let me say that in our justified haste to divert funds to meet our growing domestic needs, we should not lose sight of where federal money is really being spent. The NASA budget is conspicuous, but it amounts to roughly 5 per cent of the amount we devote to military spending. The real "domestic surplus" will come from making needed cuts in our military budget, and through the elimination of costly and unnecessary new weapons systems. The \$110 million for the space station/space shuttle program this year is less than one per cent of what we will have to pay for an unproven and potentially obsolete ABM, for example. It represents a small fraction of the money we have wasted in our unsuccessful attempt to develop a new Main Battle Tank. It is less than 20% of what we have been spending every year to develop murderous and unnecessary chemical and biological warfare agents.

My point is simply this. Just because the military budget has proven difficult to cut does not mean we should diminish our efforts to cut it; just because NASA is vulnerable and its budget easy to cut does not mean we should eliminate vital NASA programs whose cost is almost insignificant in comparison to the billions that go annually to the Defense Department.

Let us realize that man is in space to stay. The benefits of space exploration are largely unknown, but they may prove to be incalculable. The space program not only provides peaceful employment, peaceful applications of scientific knowledge, and peaceful commercial "spin-offs" to the entire nation—it also represents, in further contrast to our military spending, a peaceful and healthy form of competition and national mission in the United States and in the world as a whole. Someday, we all hope, it will provide the basis for peaceful cooperation between this nation and the Soviet Union, and undoubtedly it will aid us in our efforts to save the ecology of this planet.

Mr. MONDALE. I might say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado that it is not my intention to use the full time, and I would be guided by the plans of the manager of the bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. I had promised to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I emphatically oppose any amendment which would cripple the efforts of NASA to maintain the U.S. position of leadership in the exploration of space.

This is not the time to cut funds for this vital program. If we reduce the NASA program and the Soviets achieve a technological breakthrough in space for military purposes, then our Nation is in great jeopardy, especially in view of the growing Soviet threat.

Mr. President, the Soviets are exploring space for a military advantage. They are working feverishly on their space laboratory. It would be disastrous for our Nation to permit the Soviets to forge ahead in both space and nuclear weapons which they are attempting to accomplish.

Mr. President, aside from the needs of the Nation's security, there are many peaceful benefits to mankind which will result and are resulting from the NASA program. Scientists know that space exploration holds many promises for the peaceful benefits of all nations.

If we would relate the Nation to the body of man we would see that 200 universities throughout the country which worked on fundamental problems for NASA, 2,100 doctorates funded by NASA, improved curricula in science and mathematics throughout our school system, and 34 new scientific laboratories and research facilities on college campuses have certainly improved the educational level of the United States.

In addition, NASA and its contractors have all supplied extensive in-house as well as outside training for their personnel. It is probably safer to estimate that of the half million people who have worked on the space program at one time or another over the past 12 years, at least half of them, or a quarter of a million people, have learned new skills which were essential to meet the challenges of the space adventure. Especially in the southeast, at Marshall Space Flight Center and at Cape Kennedy, a large part of the available labor force were formerly either subsistence farmers or technologically untrained. The efforts of NASA and its contractors to employ indigenous workers and supply training rather than to import labor have resulted in the employment and training of large numbers of minority groups.

Mr. President, scientific results are already abundantly evident, even though the "time lag" between scientific discovery and application is traditionally very long. Our first satellite discovered the existence of the Van Allen radiation belt beyond the earth. Other such phenomena have been discovered.

Meteorology has been revolutionized by earth orbiting satellites, and weather forecasting and the gains from the greater precision of that art have been enormous.

Astronomy, according to Stanford Research, has become almost a new science within the last decade. It would be reasonable to say that as much has been

learned in the past decade as astronomers learned in the previous 2,000 years. But the application of this new knowledge will take time.

Mr. President, one area in which all the rules were broken regarding "time lag," however, was in communications. Almost as fast as it could be built, the first Comsat was in operation, revolutionizing worldwide communications. This is the first major commercial result of the space program, followed closely by its companion, Intelsat.

New metals and alloys were developed which are essential for the extreme requirements in space. There is greater understanding of metal strength and of stress and other forms of corrosion. These problems are still under intensive study by NASA and other laboratories.

Mr. President, medicine, biology, psychology, physiology all taught much to the interdisciplinary teams which prepared our astronauts for their journeys into space and to the moon. NASA has contributed masses of information about the behavior of well men in stressful and unusual conditions.

All of the earth sciences have been revitalized as man finally saw the earth as a whole. Agronomy, geodesy, cartography, oceanography, hydrology—in all of these it is as if the age-old barriers to knowledge have been removed and searchers are at last able to explore without hindrance as they examine the earth from the vantage point of space.

Mr. President, while education and science are essential parts of the national body, we know that within a capitalistic society, nothing is more important than economic health and growth. And in this industrialized civilization, the leading technological nation is consequently the nation most secure in its economic growth. New technology is the seed from which grow the new industries, new products and new jobs which account for the growth and prosperity of the people, and the country. No peaceful object in the history of the world has ever produced even a fraction of the new products, materials, systems, and techniques that continue to flow from the space program.

Paper which will not burn and metals which will not burst—glass that bends and will not break and films strong enough to carry a man but weigh only a few ounces, are only a few of the hundreds of new materials which have emanated from the demands of space. Thousands of new products have already found their way into our daily lives, and the number increases as the "time lag" is dissipated.

Mr. President, the total results of the expedition into space will really not be measurable within this century—any more than the impact of the discovery of America was measurable by the end of the 15th century. It will not be measurable in numbers of things which have been produced, or even in the amount of new knowledge which has been acquired—but rather, I believe it will manifest itself most significantly in the changes of mankind, all barriers to our free movement throughout our solar system have been removed. Our horizons

are the edges of the universe. Nothing now constrains us from the improvement of life on earth for all mankind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Minnesota has 43 minutes remaining. The Senator from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Colorado what the time plans are for the opponents of the amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has 3 minutes remaining; the Senator from Minnesota has 43 minutes remaining.

Mr. ALLOTT. We have used most of our time. I shall be glad to have the Senator from Minnesota proceed to use some of his time.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I propose to use only a few moments, and then I shall be prepared to yield back my time.

The comments by the Senator from South Carolina are instructive. I think further analysis is necessary. For example, how many of these useful spin-offs from the space program have been derived from unmanned instrumented flights and how many of them that are of direct use to the people of our country and to mankind have resulted from manned flights?

I think an analysis will show that the overwhelming amount of useful information available for navigation or international communication—knowledge of the Van Allen Belt, for example—have been derived as a result of unmanned instrumented flights—that part of the space program which, by all odds, has been the least expensive and concerning which there is no risk to human life; and that part of the space program which the knowledgeable scientists of this country—those who are not employed by the Space Agency or space industry—think is being starved by the present allocations of the space budget. These scientists believe that unmanned flights will be increasingly starved and will be allocated a disproportionately smaller percentage of the space budget under the present bias of the Space Agency.

The space program now is dominated by the manned flight lobby and the manned flight industry. Many of the key scientists in the space agency have resigned, and many highly experienced scientists, such as Dr. Van Allen, Dr. Adey, Dr. Gold, and others, are convinced of the biased attitude in the present space program. It is this bias that is being reflected in the pellmell rush to have this shuttle station program even before it is established that such a program is physiologically possible.

The Biosatellite III program, which was NASA's best effort to determine long duration flight problems, resulted in a dead monkey. Now we are told it was because the monkey had a low IQ. Well, it seems to me that before spending several million dollars on that program, we

might have administered the Minnesota multiphasic test, or some equivalent, to that poor monkey before we killed him.

Soyuz-9 sent two Russian cosmonauts into orbit. They lasted 18 days; they came down; and they had physiological problems, which have reinforced the fears of many of our scientists—including Dr. Adey and others—about the biomedical problems inherent in long-duration space flight.

We are spending in excess of \$1 billion on a Skylab program—to be completed in 1973—to determine whether what we are attempting to design is even possible, or whether it has to be designed to meet technical problems about which we know little. Yet NASA says, "Go on, let us spend \$110 million for a program which may or may not be useful, or may or may not be possible, because we may get some value out of that program."

We are told that the Defense Department is interested in this program. First of all, NASA is a civilian agency. The organic act setting up NASA, I think, clearly states, or implies, that it is for the purpose of achieving civilian-related space objectives. If the shuttle station has a Defense objective, I think it is for the Defense Department to come in and argue for a budget to support this project. They have not done that. Moreover, they canceled their only program akin to the shuttle station—the MOL—because the rest of their budget was more important; and even though, in the past, the Defense Department and the space agency have both contributed funds to joint efforts, in this case the Defense Department is so unimpressed that it refuses to give so much as a penny to the shuttle station program. They have offered feeble verbal support. They have offered to share in any dividends which come out of the experimentation which has cost them nothing; but they offer no money.

I think that shows how highly the Defense Department values the space shuttle station program for its purposes.

Second, it has been suggested that this program offers such rich possibilities of international cooperation that we should be willing to spend the estimated \$14 billion—or double that amount with possible overruns—on this program in order to offer this chance for the countries of the world to gather together in an exciting international effort.

Since this is such an exciting possibility, the question is how much do other countries wish to contribute to bring mankind together around a space shuttle?

The answer is that we do not know. I strongly suspect—as in the case of our previous space cooperation efforts—that the full tab or most of the tab will rest upon Uncle Sam, at a time when we could very well use the \$14 billion plus for projects and efforts here at home which so desperately cry out for solution.

The next argument is that we will save money with a reusable space shuttle. That is a most interesting mathematical calculation. At this time, we do not know what a space shuttle will ultimately cost to develop. We do not know how much it will haul. We know very little about it.

But we have a calculation, nevertheless, that it will save money. I have yet to hear how much a space shuttle will ultimately cost, or how much a space station will ultimately cost. The distinguished chairman of the House subcommittee, Mr. KARTH—who is recognized as one of the strong proponents of the space programs, and one of NASA's strong allies—came out against this space shuttle station program because he said it would be a waste of money. He and six other members of the House Space Committee were opposed to it on many grounds—including the tremendous waste of money involved—and they asked that there be a cost-benefit study to determine the cost of the program, and whether it would be cost-effective.

No such study has been made—instead, there has been merely a repetition of the assertion that for \$14 billion, we are going to save some money on this space shuttle station program.

Finally we are asked to proceed with a program which assumes man's capacity to function effectively in long-duration flights. Earlier in this debate, I placed in the RECORD three letters, one from Dr. Adey, the director of the space biology laboratory at the University of California; another from Dr. Van Allen, one of the most distinguished space scientists in the world; and another from Dr. Gold of Cornell University.

These three distinguished scientists all raised serious doubts about the physiological capacity of man for long-duration space flight. They also raised questions about the value of this program and about the relative importance of unmanned instrumented flight over manned flight—which is the key decision inherent in the decision to go ahead.

With these highly recognized and distinguished scientists speaking so strongly against this program, and with only those who have something to gain—that is, the space agency and the space industry—arguing so strongly for it, without even knowing whether it is physiologically possible to do what we propose to do, surely we can wait a few years to determine whether these hundreds of millions of dollars should be spent.

It seems to me that if the word "priority" means anything to any of us we should delete this \$110 million. If we believe that the Federal budget should be allocated differently—to provide more hope for our young people, with better education and better opportunity, better housing, and with an effort to do something about our environment—both the air and the water; we should not embark upon this costly project. If our domestic problems which involve a cost of hundreds of billions of dollars are to be responded to with an appropriate application of Federal support, surely it is in areas such as these where the cuts must come. This is the truth of the issue of priorities.

This is not vague Fourth of July oratory about spending our money more wisely. It is a key test. These are the kinds of key tests which will determine whether we are the kind of nation we know we

should be—spending our money and our resources on those matters that are most important to bringing hope and opportunity to millions of Americans, and doing something about saving the very environment upon which our life depends.

If we find that these things are less important than a space shuttle and a space station and the \$50 to \$100 billion that a manned flight to Mars will cost, then I think we are going to be hard put when we talk to our constituents about the future of this country and what we think is important. If we cannot win this kind of fight, then what is the hope for that revision of priorities?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. A matter has just come over the ticker from Cape Kennedy beginning "Paine notes the United States has been involved in more than 250 space agreements with 80 nations." I ask unanimous consent that the text of this news item be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Paine notes the United States has been involved in more than 250 space agreements with 80 nations. These include launching foreign satellites on U.S. rockets, placing experiments of other nations on American spacecraft, sharing Moon rocks with scientists of other lands and use of foreign ground stations for tracking and receipt of data from communications, weather and other types of satellites.

"By pooling the resources of many of these countries, we can work on larger projects with greater promise of return to all nations," the administrator said in an interview. "It would create a new capability for man to explore and utilize space."

"The United States is going to build the space station and the space shuttle," he said. "But I would like to see this project carried out as an international laboratory in space. If it's truly going to be a cooperative project, other nations should pick up part of the cost as well as provide the kinds of talent which they have available."

He said many countries could share in the practical benefits of a space station, such as communications, weather observation, survey of Earth's resources, and engineering, medical and scientific research.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time, if the Senator is prepared to yield back his. I suggest, though, that we do it with the understanding that we will have a very short quorum call in order to inform the membership of the Senate.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, with that understanding, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask

unanimous consent that the Senator from Mississippi be given 2 minutes before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Colorado for their courtesy.

Mr. President, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee and as a member of the Space Committee, I have been greatly interested in maximizing cooperation between the Department of Defense and NASA to achieve economies in developing technology for our national aeronautical and space programs. I believe the record is clear that the Senate Space Committee has continually encouraged and has been successful in achieving results in this area.

Over a year ago the executive branch terminated the Air Force manned orbiting laboratory program, the only Air Force experiment to determine the potential application of earth orbital manned space flight to the military mission of providing for the security of the Nation; therefore, this year I was greatly encouraged when NASA and the Air Force entered into a formal agreement to insure that the space shuttle vehicle currently under study by NASA will meet the maximum number of requirements of the Department of Defense. This agreement is intended to assure the fullest preplanning of this program and to eliminate the necessity for independent development by the Department of Defense. The result of this is a single development by NASA of a new space transportation technology which the Air Force can use to support its military activities in space.

I would be the first to agree that these activities are not now completely known. However, it is clear that we are talking about a system which would not be available before the latter part of this decade, a time sufficiently far in advance that we do not know what defensive systems the security of this Nation may require; but prudent judgment behooves us to be prepared in all areas, particularly the medium of space.

In this regard, I cite testimony of Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering, before the Senate Space Committee earlier this year. Dr. Foster said:

I think when one looks ahead a decade, the kind of things one could then do might be so different from what we were able to do in planning the MOL program that we could well see a major change in our approach to all military operations in space. The kind of things we may want to do could be done with the space shuttle if its promise of economy and flexibility is achieved.

In view of the fact that the national security demands that we preserve our options and the national economy demands economy in our governmental programs, I urge that the space shuttle study program be fully supported and the amendment to curtail this study before we know what promise the system offers should be rejected. If the space shuttle study is denied, we are also deny-

ing the Nation the ability to preserve its options for defense systems that might be needed in the future.

I favored the canceling of the MOL, although that was done by Secretary of Defense Laird rather than our committee. Under all the circumstances, I thought it was a wise move. I am very pleased that we have a working arrangement now between the Department of Defense and NASA, that this shuttle program, as it is called, will be based upon possibilities broad enough, at a maximum degree, that might be helpful with reference to our preparedness problems in the decades ahead. For that reason, I support the committee position with reference to this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PASTORE (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON). If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), is paired with the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE). If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) is paired with the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN). If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea" and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), would each vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and

voting, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), would vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senators from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN and Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) are absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), and the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 32, as follows:

[No. 211 Leg.]

YEAS—28

Bayh	Hartke	Muskie
Beilmon	Hollings	Pearson
Burdick	Hughes	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy	Randolph
Case	McCarthy	Spong
Cotton	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Eagleton	McIntyre	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Metcalf	
Goodell	Mondale	

NAYS—32

Allen	Gurney	Saxbe
Allott	Hatfield	Schweiker
Baker	Holland	Smith, Ill.
Boggs	Hruska	Stennis
Cannon	Jackson	Symington
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Talmadge
Cranston	Long	Thurmond
Dole	McClellan	Tower
Domnick	Miller	Tydings
Ellender	Montoya	Yarborough
Griffin	Packwood	

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Pastore, for.

NOT VOTING—39

Aiken	Goldwater	Mundt
Anderson	Gore	Murphy
Bennett	Gravel	Nelson
Bible	Hansen	Percy
Brooke	Harris	Prouty
Church	Hart	Ribicoff
Cook	Javits	Russell
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Dodd	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Mansfield	Sparkman
Ervin	Mathias	Stevens
Fannin	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	Moss	Young, Ohio

So Mr. MONDALE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) and the other members of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the fine job they have done in reporting the independent offices appropriation bill to the Senate for its consideration. Further, Mr. President, I am happy that the subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee recommended an increase in appropriations for the Veterans' Administration of \$100 million under the medical and hospital appropriations categories. Eighty million dollars of this increase is to be used for medical care and \$20 million to be used for construction of new facilities for the veterans medical and hospital program. I am sure, Mr. President, that we would all agree that this increase represents a bare minimum and that, due to the high numbers of men who have suffered Vietnam casualties and who are returning to our veterans hospitals for extended medical care, we must continue to provide the funds necessary to enlarge and update our facilities and hire the staff necessary to give these young men the kind of medical care they so richly deserve.

In my own State of Oklahoma, while the Veterans' Administration hospitals do an excellent job toward meeting the health needs of our returning Vietnam veterans, as well as veterans of previous wars, we still need additional facilities and additional personnel in order to fully take care of the health needs of these young men. It is my understanding that with its share of the additional \$100 million approved by the Appropriations Committee, Oklahoma should employ additional general medical care personnel at a cost of \$198,200. These needed personnel have not been employed previously because funds were not available. Additionally, Oklahoma could utilize \$1,112,100 of these funds to eliminate its equipment maintenance and repair backlog in the veterans hospitals and \$62,100 of the funds could be utilized to eliminate the dental case backlog; \$47,600 could be utilized to employ additional physician's assistants with \$35,100 to be used for allied health and intensive care training programs.

Mr. President, I think that the needs of Oklahoma can be repeated over and over throughout the Nation in Veterans' Administration hospitals—275,000 young men have been wounded in the Indochina war. About one-half of this number require some degree of immediate hospitalization and most will at some point in the future seek Veterans' Administration hospital or outpatient care. As the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) pointed out in his testimony before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations:

In 1970, over 50,000 Vietnam veterans so far have been admitted to VA hospitals, and in 1969, Vietnam veterans made over 500,000 visits for outpatient medical care at VA facilities.

This increased caseload, coupled with

care for pre-Vietnam veterans makes it more necessary for us to expand our veteran health care delivery system.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly that the VA offers an outstanding health care program to those who have served us in the military. However, rising costs and increasing numbers of wounded make it imperative that we provide additional funds to enable the VA to enlarge its medical facilities and employ the personnel necessary to assure these young men the best health care that money can buy. I, therefore, feel that the \$100 million added to the appropriation for health care and hospital facilities for the Veterans' Administration is a very bare minimum that is required. I certainly hope that the Senate will approve this additional amount and that the Senate conferees will stand firm for this additional appropriation in the conference with the House of Representatives.

FUNDS FOR SAN ANTONIO FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the independent agencies appropriations bill as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee makes a change in the House bill that seems unfortunate and will be unnecessarily costly to the taxpayers. The committee bill would reprogram money for the proposed Federal building in San Antonio, Tex. This would result in at least a 2- to 3-year delay in the construction of the building and would no doubt increase its cost.

The reason suggested for the change by the General Services Administration is that the determination has not yet been made as to whether part of the physical facilities of the HemisFair pavilion will be incorporated in the Federal building complex, and, therefore, the project is not yet ready for construction. I believe such a decision could be made in a very short time, however, if necessary, and that construction of the main building could be started virtually as soon as funds are made available. All basic construction planning has already been completed. Rising construction costs and replanning expenses are certain to be encountered if we delay this project by reprogramming its funds as the committee has recommended.

I hope the conferees on this bill will reconsider the situation of this project and will agree to the House view on the merits of funding the San Antonio Federal building this year.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we have been discussing a time limitation on the debate. It seems to be perfectly agreeable to all parties concerned. Subject to the consent of the Senate, I should like to propound a unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). There will be order in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I understand that if we obtain this unani-

mous-consent agreement, there will be no further votes tonight.

I ask unanimous consent that starting tomorrow there be a time limitation on the debate of 1 hour on each amendment, 30 minutes to the side, 1 hour on any amendments thereto, and 2 hours on the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, when does the time limitation commence?

Mr. PASTORE. It will commence right after the amendment is offered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HATFIELD TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is the intention of the leadership to have the Senate convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning and that an hour will be afforded to the distinguished Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD). There will then be a short morning hour and we will then commence the debate.

Mr. PASTORE. The debate will start at about 12:30 or so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). Does the Senator ask that be in the usual form?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement subsequently reduced to writing is as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, July 7, 1970, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 17548) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to two hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A PILOT PROGRAM DESIGNATED AS THE YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 1076.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representa-

tives to the bill (S. 1076) to establish a pilot program in the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture designated as the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

POLICY AND PURPOSE

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the gainful employment of American youth, representing all segments of society, in the healthful outdoor atmosphere afforded in the national park system, the national forest system, the national wildlife refuge system, and other public land and water areas creates an opportunity for understanding and appreciation of the Nation's natural environment and heritage. Accordingly, it is the purpose of this Act to further the development and maintenance of natural resources of the United States by the youth, upon whom will fall the ultimate responsibility for maintaining and managing these resources for the American people.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

SEC. 2. (a) To carry out the purposes of this Act, there is hereby established in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture a three-year pilot program designated as the Youth Conservation Corps (hereinafter referred to as the "Corps"). The Corps shall consist of young men and women who are permanent residents of the United States, its territories, or possessions, who have attained age sixteen but have not attained age nineteen, and whom the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may employ during the summer months without regard to the civil service or classification laws, rules, or regulations, for the purpose of developing, preserving, or maintaining lands and waters of the United States under the jurisdiction of the appropriate Secretary.

(b) The Corps shall be open to youth of both sexes and youth of all social, economic, and racial classifications, with no person being employed as a member of the Corps for a term in excess of ninety days during any single year.

SECRETARIAL DUTIES

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture shall:

(1) designate the public lands upon which members of the Corps can be effectively utilized in conservation work, and coordinate Corps efforts with those holding jurisdiction over the respective public lands;

(2) determine the rates of pay, hours, and other conditions of employment in the Corps: *Provided*, That members of the Corps shall not be deemed to be Federal employees, other than for the purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, and chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) arrange directly or by contract with any public agency or organization or any private nonprofit agency or organization which has been in existence for five years for transportation, lodging, subsistence, other services and equipment for the needs of members of the Corps in fulfilling their duties: *Provided*, That whenever economically feasible, existing but unoccupied Federal facilities (including abandoned military installations) shall be utilized for the purposes of the Corps, And *Provided further*, That to minimize transportation costs, Corps members shall be employed on conservation projects as near to their places of residence as is feasible.

(4) promulgate regulations to insure the safety, health, and welfare of the Corps members;

(5) prepare a report, indicating the most efficient method for initiating a cost-shar-

ing youth conservation program with State natural resource, conservation, or outdoor recreation agencies, which report shall be submitted to the President not later than one year following enactment of this Act for transmittal to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

(b) The provision of title II of the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 251, 270) shall not apply to appointments made to the Corps, to temporary supervisory personnel, or to temporary program support staff.

SECRETARIAL REPORTS

SEC. 4. Upon completion of each year's pilot program, the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare a joint report detailing the contribution of the program toward achieving the purposes of the Act and providing recommendations. Each report shall be submitted to the President not later than one hundred and eighty days following completion of that year's pilot program. The President shall transmit the report to the Congress for review and appropriate action.

AUTHORIZATION OF FUNDS

SEC. 5. For three years following enactment of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated amounts not to exceed \$3,500,000 annually to be made available to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the purposes of this Act.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House on S. 1076 and ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. CRANSTON) appointed Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. STEVENS, conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1971

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17548) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the pending bill. I will not discuss it tonight. The amendment would cut back the base appropriations to the House levels. It would be a reduction of about \$122 million.

I will call up the amendment tomorrow and discuss it at that time and ask for a rollcall vote on tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

ANSWER TO CRITICISM OF THE VICE PRESIDENT BY MR. BERNARD SEGAL

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, Vice President AGNEW has been unfairly criticized

by Mr. Bernard Segal, president of the American Bar Association.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an answer by the Vice President to the criticism of Mr. Segal.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. Bernard Segal, President of the American Bar Association, has stated that my recent criticism of remarks made by Mr. Joseph Rhodes shows that I am inconsistent about dissent.

Mr. Segal is apparently confused about the thrust of my criticism. It had nothing to do with Mr. Rhodes' right to dissent as a private citizen, but rather dealt with the basic requirement that, in fairness, fact-finding investigations do not properly begin with a recitation of unsubstantiated opinion by the investigators.

Mr. Rhodes, among other visceral comments, stated: "Governor Reagan was bent on killing people for his own political gain." This pronouncement is immature and ridiculous for Rhodes the citizen to make, but it is within his right of dissent. But for Rhodes, the Federal commissioned investigator, to make such a gratuitous observation to the press about the most visible symbol of establishment resistance against student violence is outrageous and, more important, disqualifying because it shows a transparent bias and a closed mind on the subject matter under examination.

Before the Commission was even organized, member Rhodes had allowed his emotions to indict and condemn Governor Reagan without even a rudimentary investigation of the facts.

It is frankly surprising that I have to make this distinction clear to the President of the American Bar Association, of all people. He should know that there can be no justice in a determination made by those who have made their decisions before the evidence is received. Mr. Rhodes' sour-stomached statement was not a disagreement based on fact, but a hare-brained unprovable bluster.

PROGRAM

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that when the pending appropriations bill is disposed of, the next item to be taken up will be the agricultural appropriations bill?

Mr. KENNEDY. That is the intention of the majority leader, as I understand it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator know now at what time the agricultural appropriations bill will come up? Certain Senators want to be notified so that they can be present.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is the best judgment of the leadership at the present time that there are at least five known amendments to the pending bill. So, upon that basis I would hope that we could finish the pending business some time in the middle of tomorrow afternoon. I am sure that the majority

leader would want to begin the agricultural appropriations bill on tomorrow afternoon. The majority leader will be back the first thing in the morning, and we can respond at that time. I would hope that we could begin on the agricultural appropriations bill tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) is to be recognized for an hour tomorrow morning.

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourn, it adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HATFIELD AT 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the reading of the Journal on tomorrow, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it will then be the intention after the distinguished Senator from Oregon has completed, to have a short morning hour, the time to be limited to 3 minutes, and then to get started on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin as close to 12:30 as possible.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 7, 1970, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 6, 1970:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Malcolm R. Lovell, Jr., of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, vice Arnold R. Weber.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Darrell M. Trent, of Kansas, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, vice Fred J. Russell.